DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 415 UD 031 527

TITLE	Theories and Realities: A Symposium on Race and Poverty. Proceedings (Chicago, IL, January 19, 1994).
INSTITUTION	AT&T Communications, Inc., New York, NY.; Chicago Urban League, Ill.
PUB DATE	19 Jan 94
NOTE	76p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ethnic Groups; *Futures (of Society); Low Income Groups; *Policy Formation; *Poverty; Public Policy; Racial Bias; Racial Differences; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Segregation; United States History; *Urban Problems; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

In January 1994, the Chicago Urban League (Illinois) brought together 11 of Chicago's leading scholars and community leaders for a discussion of the intersection of race and poverty. Nearly 300 people attended the symposium. The tone of the opening panel, "Racial/Ethnic Community Structures and the Making of Public Policy," was set by remarks by Paul Kleppner, who questioned whether people in Chicago have learned enough from their past to create consensus around public policy issues. Policy making issues were discussed by the four panel participants: Sokoni Karanja, Bernarda Wong, Jean Mayer, and Migdalia Rivera. The discussions of this panel made it clear that broad generalizations about any single group are made at great risk. The second panel, "Structure of Racial Segregation and Poverty," brought together the scholars William J. Wilson and Douglas S. Massey with radio host John D. Calloway to discuss segregation as a fundamentally divisive force in American urban life. The final panel, moderated by Kenneth Smith, brought together sociology professor Aldon Morris and business executive James O'Connor for a discussion of the future of policy making and the need for change. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 404 415

THEORIES AND REALITIES:
A SYMPOSIUM ON RACE AND POVERTY

PROCEEDINGS
January 19, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Fox
C.U.L
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Sponsored by

The Chicago Urban League

and

AT&T

AT&T

CHICAGO
URBAN LEAGUE

UD031521

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

Page ii **Preface**

Page 1 **Introductions**

Mayor Richard M. Daley
Susan Atteridge, Public Relations Vice President, AT&T
James W. Compton, President & CEO, Chicago Urban League

Page 5 **Panel 1: Racial/Ethnic Community Structures and the Making of Public Policy**

Dr. Paul Kleppner, Director, Office for Social Policy Research, Northern Illinois University
Dr. Sokoni Karanja, President, Centers for New Horizons
Bernarda Wong, Executive Director, Chinese American Service League
Jean Mayer, Vice Chair of the Board, Southwest Parish and Neighborhood Federation
Migdalia Rivera, Executive Director, Latino Institute

Page 25 **Panel 2: Structure of Racial Segregation and Poverty**

Dr. William J. Wilson, Lucy Flower University Professor of Sociology and Public Policy, University of Chicago
Dr. Douglas S. Massey, Professor, Irving B. Harris School of Public Policy Studies & Department of Sociology, University of Chicago
John D. Callaway, host, WTTW-TV's *Chicago Tonight*

Page 51 **Panel 3: What Lies Ahead?**

Dr. Aldon Morris, Chair, Sociology Department, Northwestern University
James J. O'Connor, Chairman & CEO, Commonwealth Edison Company
Reverend Dr. Kenneth B. Smith, President, Chicago Theological Seminary

PREFACE

In January, 1994 the Chicago Urban League brought together eleven of Chicago's leading scholars and community leaders for a public discussion of the problem of the intersection of race and poverty. Nearly 300 persons joined us to participate in those discussions held at the AT&T Corporate Center in downtown Chicago.

As Paul Kleppner makes clear in his opening remarks for Panel One, history, both real and imagined, can define racial-ethic group responses to one another. In many cases, public policy debates center around economic or class interests. Yet racial or community history creates suspicion, alignments and coalitions that crosscut economic interests, making a purely class-based interpretation of public affairs problematic. Kleppner posed the question of whether Chicagoans have remembered too much and learned too little and whether that has encumbered those who would try to create consensus around issues of public policy.

To explore this question in the widest possible way, four of the most prominent Chicago leaders associated with racial or ethnic groups were invited to lead the discussion. Sokoni Karanja countered Kleppner's position, stating that one of the major lessons of history was a well-founded suspicion of whites by African Americans, a position that indeed might get in the way of community around issues, but that recent events continued to justify. Karanja emphasized the need for community control over both planning and resources.

Bernarda Wong pointed out that perceived scarcity of resources embodied in various welfare or immigration policies tended to pit members of various groups who feel themselves to be at risk against one another.

Millie Rivera and Jean Mayer focused on the diversity within groups, often perceived by outsiders and portrayed in the popular media as uniform, despite wide divisions within them. Latino elected officials, for instance, were torn over support for NAFTA by conflicting "homeland" interests, such as effects on the economies of Puerto Rico or Mexico. Mayer pointed out that over the years, there had been considerable change within ethnic white communities and that in any case, Chicago's white communities were far less monolithic than they may be viewed either by the press or outsiders.

If there is a single lesson to be taken from this panel, it was that broad generalizations about any single group are made at great risk. There is a lack of broad understanding of why people do much of what they do. Development of coalitions and analysis of support or opposition to policy needs to account for the remarkable pluralism that characterizes the entire Chicago political scene, as well as commonly-identified major racial/ethnic groups within it.

The symposium's second panel brought together perhaps the nation's two foremost scholars of the sociology of race and poverty, professors William Julius Wilson and Douglas Massey of the University of Chicago.

Wilson has distinguished himself with two books written in the 1980s, *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions* and *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City*. This body of work has largely shaped the terms in which urban change, race, and economic transformation are discussed.

Although a widely published scholar in the sociology of race for many years, Douglas Massey reached broad popular prominence with his 1992 book co-authored with Nancy Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Therein they presented arguments, taken by many to challenge Wilson's positions regarding the relative significance of racial discrimination as the defining characteristic of the struggle of urban ghettos for economic survival. Massey argued that racial segregation was virtually pervasive in America's largest cities and that it was this segregation, against the will of the segregated, that inevitably led to debilitating concentration of poverty.

In their symposium presentations, each scholar focused on his most recent research. Wilson discussed new material on Chicago, drawing upon new data from the Urban Poverty and Family life project, which he directs at the University of Chicago.

For many, the key moment in the panel may have come with moderator John Callaway's first question posed to Wilson and Massey: while there is clearly difference in nuance between the work of each scholar, are not the two in basic agreement that segregation continues to be a fundamentally divisive force in American urban life, with disastrous economic consequences?

The final panel brought together two leaders of perhaps the most divergent backgrounds, sociology professor Aldon Morris of Northwestern University and Commonwealth Edison Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, James O'Connor.

Professor Morris grew up on Chicago's south side and is a student of the civil rights movement and political mobilization. His remarks at the symposium made clear that he has not forgotten where he comes from and the struggle in which African Americans have had to engage. His remarks evoked an interpretation of history that speaks both to the reality of the color of the power structure in America and to the challenge before our nation in times when, as the previous two panels so clearly illustrated, racial identification, whatever its complexity, remains of surpassing importance to many people. The urgency of the need to address these problems - their importance anchored in their immediacy - came through not only in Morris' diction but also in his tone, unmistakable to the audience that afternoon.

James O'Connor brought to the symposium a decidedly different approach, equally representative of his experience. O'Connor described a deep and longstanding concern over the problems of racial division and poverty in Chicago and the nation, and described in many ways the personal journey of a man deeply concerned for society searching for ways to use his position to bring positive change. Rather than sweeping interpretation, O'Connor couched his positions in terms of particular policy initiatives around education and job growth, anchored in private sector-oriented programming. While Morris put forth the challenge of paradigm change to ever address sufficiently the problems of racial division and poverty, O'Connor responded that our existing systems afford great opportunity for progress if approached with persistence and a willingness to experiment with new approaches.

The following proceedings of the Symposium include texts of the presentations of the conference panelists.

James H. Lewis
Vice President,
Research and Planning

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MAYOR RICHARD M. DALEY

Thank you very much, Jim Compton, and to AT&T for the sponsorship of this symposium on race and poverty. I want to thank Jim for his efforts on behalf of the people of the City of Chicago. The Urban League has been at the forefront of economic opportunities and job opportunities and to deal with the problems that, unfortunately, we in cities in America face on an every day basis.

The documentaries, speeches, and tributes in celebration of Martin Luther King remind us of our progress in the fight against racism. But the other 364 days of the year remind us how far we have to go before Dr. King's dream is real. A whole generation of young Americans seems oblivious to his message of non-violence. They are trapped in a world of gangs, guns, drugs and abuse and have no idea how to get out. Hate crimes are increasingly common throughout the world. Ethnic and religious wars persist. And here at home -- crushing poverty remains the condition for so many Americans.

The problem is most acute in the inner-city and among African Americans. It's important to debate the causes as we are doing today. But most of us would agree that the changing nature of the economy, drug abuse, crime, family breakdown, teenage pregnancy, declining school performance -- and racism -- all contribute to the problem. And there is no single solution that deals with all of these issues. Rather, it is a combination of many things.

The easiest answer to poverty is, of course, jobs -- but in this economy, new jobs don't come easily. And the ones that do come are often out of reach to a growing class of people. Professor William Julius Wilson -- in his book *The Truly Disadvantaged* -- makes the point that the loss of manufacturing jobs has created a new underclass without the skills or ability to compete. Today, many blue collar jobs require basic computer, problem-solving and analytical skills that are not being taught in school. People without a high school diploma will be at more of a disadvantage than ever before. For many jobs, even two years of college isn't enough. That's why improving our schools must be a top priority. Throughout my administration, I have been aggressively advancing school reform to introduce greater flexibility and accountability. In my view, we're ready to take the logical next step, which are charter schools. By their nature, they impose tougher performance standards -- both for students and for teachers. The children deserve no less. The people of Chicago deserve no less. And the employers of the future will demand no less. And these kind of reforms are the foundation on which we can build a consensus on long-term funding solutions.

In terms of crime, our efforts are extensive -- built around our community policing program, which goes citywide this year. Beyond that, we confiscate more guns than any city in America. And we fund over 150 community groups working to keep young people out of gangs. I've also set up a think tank of leading educators, social service providers, business, government and community leaders to come up with ways to better direct young people into positive activities. It's called the Youth Development Task Force. They're evaluating money we spend on education, recreation, libraries, parks, and job-training in four disadvantaged Chicago communities to see if it can be better spent. They will have a report in the spring, and it will guide us as we attempt to address youth delinquency, as well as other problems like family breakdown, teenage pregnancy an racism.

These problems do not lend themselves to straightforward solutions. It's more important than ever that we focus on the root causes and get to them as early as possible -- because they impede progress in so many other areas.

I want to emphasize my support for this symposium. The development of policies to deal with issues of racism and poverty must be as open and comprehensive as possible. Fighting racism is an ongoing struggle for each individual -- and for society at-large. We all need to look closely at ourselves and ask whether our individual background and upbringing affect our perceptions of problems and solutions. Beyond what we can do as individuals -- governments, universities and institutions of business and culture must be vigilant in their efforts to enforce and abide by anti-discrimination and affirmative action laws.

Thirty years ago, federal marshals were called in to integrate public universities in the south. Just two weeks ago, federal marshals were required to integrate a public housing complex in Texas. Clearly the struggle against racism and discrimination continues. Clearly, we must do more. Clearly, we must do better. I welcome your input in the effort to make Chicago a city of hope and opportunity for people of all income levels and backgrounds. Thank you.

SUSAN ATTERIDGE

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the AT&T Corporate Center. We're very proud to be participating as a co-sponsor for this symposium. I'm really delighted that so many of you are here today in spite of the weather. AT&T takes very seriously our commitment to the communities in which our employees live and work. We care about these communities. We're committed within our own work force to improving diversity of all races, of all ethnic backgrounds, for both men and women at all levels. But we're equally committed to working with communities for long-term solutions to problems, such as the mayor outlined, such as we're here to talk about today. We're not alike and that's one of the beauties and the strength of diversity that I think only recently have we begun to realize that it is a strength. We don't all think alike, and that's a beauty and a strength of dialogue and of forums such as this. I'm really looking forward to the diversity of our opinions coming out in this symposium and making something stronger so we can move forward. Thank you for coming and I think we've got a terrific program.

JAMES W. COMPTON

As the proliferation of scholarship, policy studies and debate in recent years attest, the challenges of creating racial and ethnic equity, economic parody, and truly equal opportunity continue as perhaps the most vexing and serious problems continuing to face our society today. Studies generated from the 1990 census demonstrate high levels in residential segregation in our largest cities virtually unchanged from 1980, growing gaps between rich and poor, and a continued disproportionate presence of minority persons among the work force. The persistence of these serious problems demands the most rigorous search for answers and so the Chicago Urban League has convened today, along with AT&T and along with you, many of the leading scholars, community activist leaders and others to help to understand, interpret and hopefully begin the solving of these problems. Professors William Julius Wilson and Douglas Massey of the University of Chicago have each written extensively on the intersection of racial segregation and poverty, producing some of the most provocative work yet written on the subject. Professor Paul Kleppner, of Northern Illinois University is astute on the meaning of race and ethnicity to our political system, while Professor Aldon Morris from Northwestern University has written extensively on the process and meaning of racial change in this country. We also have with us today and want to welcome leaders who have played critical roles in interpreting the aspirations and needs of their respective communities. We have Migdalia Rivera, Executive Director of the Latino Institute, Sokoni Karanja, Executive Director of the Centers for New Horizons, Bernie Wong, Executive Director of the Chinese American Service League, and Jean Mayer, a long-time chair of the Southwest Parish and Neighborhood Federation. This afternoon we will have with us James J. O'Connor, Chairman and CEO of Commonwealth Edison, and Dr. Kenneth B. Smith, President of the Chicago Theological Seminary, each of whom has provided more than 20 years of civic leadership to this community and is deeply interested in achieving racial and ethnic justice for our society.

Today's program is structured to provide three different ways of exploring the problems of racial division and poverty and the need for social change. This morning's opening panel will discuss how the structures of communities, racial/ethnic history and culture have defined the parameters of public policy options through our local political systems. This panel will focus on the presentation and discussion of major interpretations of the impact of racial segregation on economic structure and opportunity from the perspectives of two of the nation's leading sociologists. This afternoon's panel will present potentially contrasting interpretations of what is necessary to achieve meaningful social change as viewed from the perspectives of an expert on the history of the Civil Rights Movement and leadership of Chicago's business communities. Today's symposium is structured such that each panel will consist of presentations or debate among the speakers to be followed by active discussions with you, members of the audience. Microphones should be accessible throughout the room and I hope each of you will take advantage of the opportunity to engage today's presenters in a discussion of the important issues that face us today.

PANEL I:

RACIAL/ETHNIC COMMUNITY STRUCTURES AND THE MAKING OF PUBLIC POLICY

PAUL KLEPPNER

The purpose of this discussion this morning is to focus on how the history and identities of different communities offer opportunities or, in some cases, create barriers to reaching consensus on public policy.

One of the great charms of the city of Chicago, I think, is its diversity, its heterogeneity. This is apparent in the neighborhoods of the city. If you walk around and see the diversity of neighborhoods you will see simply a reflection of the diversity of the population of the city of Chicago. This is one of the city's great strengths, it seems to me. It symbolizes its cosmopolitan international character.

However, there's another side to that coin. Diversity has a negative side too. It means that different kinds of population groups have to learn how to relate to each other. They have to learn how to work together. They have to learn how to live together. They have to learn, in essence, how to get along with each other. That's not a simple task, especially when groups come, as they have to Chicago, from all over this country and from all over the world, and in many cases have brought with them to this city the old animosities that they experienced and the historical roots of which lie in lands far removed. A classic instance, for example. The Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics, when they migrated to the United States and to Chicago, did not forget, unfortunately, that they hated each other and they continued their animosity here and in other cities, just as they still do in Europe today.

The problem lies not only in these transplanted animosities, but rather in the process of mobility itself. That is, mobility creates differences between groups because it brings groups together that previously had not had contact with each other before. One classic illustration of that in the 19th century. Consider Chicago's inflow of Catholics from Ireland, from Germany, from Italy, from Poland, and you have created now a question that never came up in Europe, and that question is whose national practices shall prevail within the Catholic church. It's a question that is never posed in Europe. It works itself out in terms of which language shall be used in the non-Latin parts of the Catholic liturgy, what kinds of assistants will be appointed, what kinds of assistant pastors will be appointed to the churches, what shall be the language of instruction in the parochial school. All of these kinds of questions never arise in Europe. They arise in the American context, in the urban context, because diverse groups come together for the first time and grapple with the problems of working and living together.

Some of these problems that arise from this diversity and groups coming into contact with each other become political issues because very often public policy questions are at stake. You can see that very clearly, for example, in the old 19th century or early 20th century battles over prohibition where groups, and not only native stock groups, but immigrant groups as well believed that it was sinful to consume alcoholic beverages. They then utilized the power of the state, the public power, to impose their conception of morality on everybody else. At this point, their moral interests become a public issue. Once issues such as these become public and political issues, they foster, as politics inevitably does, a kind of us-against-them outlook. As long as the issue remains alive in politics, then that us-against-them outlook continues. Politics can become a mobilization of neighborhoods and groups within neighborhoods in defense of what many people believe is their own way of life, their own culture. The consequence is to exaggerate the appearance of homogeneity within each group. Each group appears to outsiders to be wholly homogeneous. Each group appears to be a monolith because it turns out on election day, voting strongly against those candidates that oppose its point of view. Each side then sees the other side, the other set of groups, as monolithic.

This process is very natural, perhaps the inevitable consequence of varied population groups coming into contact with each other within the context of a democratic polity. In the process, groups sort themselves out. They develop a consciousness of themselves, an identity of their own backgrounds, and they develop, to some extent, some level of political cohesiveness. The problem is, however, that conflicts once fought, even if they are resolved in some way or another, don't simply fade away. Those involved with them hold memories of them and these memories are often passed along to the next generation. And sometimes to politicians, for their own purposes, keep these kinds of conflicts alive through public postures in order to mobilize their constituents and to keep their base intact.

In essence, we cannot escape our own histories. Groups and the individuals who comprise those groups do not face new situations with blank minds. We face new situations with memories, some of which we have experienced ourselves, others of which have been transmitted to us from earlier generations. There is a benefit to this kind of memory. It can lead us or it can help us to correct mistakes, or at least it can help us to avoid repeating the same mistakes over and over again. But just as there is a positive side to this kind of memory or to history, so too there is a burden. That is, history and our memories of these past conflicts hampers new beginnings by reminding us over and over again of old hostilities. This memory of past conflict often prevents groups from seeing and seizing the common ground and developing a consensus on public policy and then forging coalitions to implement that consensus.

The following panel will talk about how the histories of groups and communities can help or hinder the development of positive group relations, how the histories of groups and of communities can help or hinder efforts to work together to develop mutually beneficial public policy. All of the panelists were asked not to prepare any kind of formal statements or opening remarks.

To initiate this dialogue, let me put on the table what I think is a provocative proposition. As an historian, when I see a public policy issue raised in Chicago, almost inevitably it tends to be framed more often than not in terms of racial and ethnic conflict. That can be a problem, I submit, because too many groups in Chicago have remembered too much and learned too little from their past experiences. Now, what I'd like to do is call upon the panelists to comment on that proposition. I'll begin with Sokoni Karanja.

SOKONI KARANJA: Well, I think there was a book called *Black Rage* back in the Sixties that said that paranoia, when it was based on reality, was healthy. My sense of the policy questions and issues that are put on the table, particularly as they reference a place like Grand Boulevard, is that the reality seems to suggest that the defenses that have been put up should remain in place and our guard should not be lowered; that in fact the community must take on the task of building itself in a much more intense kind of way, because it understands that most of the policies that are prescribed are going to act against its ultimate development. You see a situation where you have as much concentrated poverty as you have in a place like Grand Boulevard, that was caused by the building of large numbers of units of public housing, and was opposed by many people in the community who recognized the potential devastation of that kind of concentration.

When you see that, you understand that whatever new policies that are coming forth may not act in your best interest, especially if you are on land that is considered very, very valuable, like Ida B. Wells, Stateway Gardens, and the Washington Park complexes along the lakefront. What we really have is not a memory that is antithetical to our development, but one that will hopefully protect us and allow us to go forward in a way that is constructive and in the best interest of that community, hopefully.

PAUL KLEPPNER: How might that work out though? If the context is such that the instinctive reaction is suspicion, how do you get beyond that?

SOKONI KARANJA: Once you understand that the responsibility is yours, then you begin to think about what kind of resources we need and how we define those resources, and how we begin to build the community in such a way that allows us to control what is going on in the community, rather than having outside forces coming in and imposing their particular views on it. Help from the outside certainly, but definition coming from the inside.

PAUL KLEPPNER: But isn't it inevitable though? For example, I think of the situation at Cabrini-Green and Vincent Lane's efforts there. Isn't it inevitable though that those tenants are going to have to deal with the bureaucratic structure of the Chicago Housing Authority?

SOKONI KARANJA: Most certainly. I'm not suggesting that you don't have to deal with those structures, but what you have to do with those structures is begin to help those structures understand that people need to have development and involvement in the process at all times. Let me give you an example. They have done several renovations of buildings in public housing. The renovations have not involved the people in the community, and that is so in Cabrini-Green. Those buildings that have been renovated are now devastated. Unless people are developed, unless people are involved, unless there's that kind of substantive involvement of people going forward, there is not going to be the kind of transformation that Mr. Lane wants or that the people all over the city want.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Bernie Wong, let me turn to next. Bernie, would you care to comment on the proposition and some of the things that Sokoni has said?

BERNIE WONG: In terms of the Asian community, I think their impact on policy, which we can look at in history, has gone back many, many years. We can look at the early Immigration Act that has really impacted the Asian community particularly -- and I'm more familiar with the Chinese community -- where numerous immigration acts from early years in the U.S. history were really targeted to limit the entrance of the Asians and the Chinese into this country. Many of you have heard about Angel Island in San Francisco. It's now a tourist attraction, but it has been a place where many Chinese have stayed for many years in pretty much an internment camp because of the immigration paranoia at that time and not wanting the Chinese to come into this country. Many of the individuals who were trying to bring their spouse over, the spouses were interrogated and then were put into Angel Island for many years, being interrogated constantly before they would be released. Some of them were not released to their spouse. Some of them were sent back to China because the suspicion was that they were not the spouse of a person here. They were asked questions like how many steps you have in the back of your house in China, so it really shows the paranoia and how it impacts on policies, especially in the case of immigration policies.

The most recent concern is the legislation that President Clinton is proposing in terms of the welfare reform. I think that it has the potential of pitting the different racial groups with each other. The welfare reform proposes that there will be no welfare assistance for individuals who have not become citizens, for non-citizen immigrants. In the Asian community there are a lot of non-citizen immigrants because many of them, because of the language, have not gone on to become citizens. To become a citizen you've got to go through the interview. Most of the people in this room do not have to go through that, but going through that interview is an excruciating experience, especially for a limited English individual. So many people choose not to become a citizen, which means that if this proposal goes through you will not be able to get assistance. I think it may cause some problems in terms of being seen as a racial issue because then the money that is saved from that proposal supposedly will to go into helping with welfare parents in day care, as well as training. I can see this as a potential problem in terms of other racial groups feeling that, well, then we have more money to go into that kind of program; whereas generally those programs are not widely used by the Asian community.

When Mrs. Clinton was here, I had a chance to talk to her for a couple of minutes on the health reform situation. The health reform proposal bringing health care to the community is great. However, I don't see any really serious plan of bringing training of bilingual professionals into this whole proposal. Saying that, yes, you can choose whichever doctor you want in your community doesn't really bring the level of care that we want; because we do not have enough bilingual medical professionals, especially at different levels. We're not just talking about doctors, but we're talking about all kinds of peer professional levels. I think if the administration is serious about this, they have to talk about a whole package of training, especially bilingual training in our community.

PAUL KLEPPNER: If I follow what you're saying correctly, I think in a nutshell one of the points you're making is that many of these initiatives, particularly at the national level, are going to create a kind of competition for resources that may pit one set of groups against another set of groups.

Let me take that to another area. As the Asian-American community, and particularly the Chinese-American community in Chicago, expands physically, isn't there going to be a competition for space? This city has a great history of this, of course--groups expanding and great competition for space and resistance by other groups to incoming new groups. Isn't that going to happen? Or has it already happened with the Asian-American community?

BERNIE WONG: Oh, it certainly has happened. The Asian community, as all of you know, is the fastest growing population not only in Chicago, but the whole United States.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Faster growing than the Latino community in Chicago?

BERNIE WONG: Right, not so much in numbers, but percentage-wise it's the fastest rate. To give you an example, Between 1980 to 1990, the census count for the Asians went up over 850 percent in the Bridgeport area. This is very isolated in terms of one locality, but there are a number of localities where the population went up. Uptown went up twenty-some percent. There are a number of other places, but Bridgeport is a very unique situation with an 850 percent increase in the Asian population. Of course, it's mostly Chinese. That presents a lot of problems. It presents a lot of opportunities, but it presents a lot of problems. For example, we laugh when we say that because in Bridgeport the best choice is an Italian-Caucasian to go in and help you to buy a house.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Not Irish?

BERNIE WONG: Irish would be good too. Then you bargain the price and then you bring in your Chinese buyer into the scene. A lot of times you can see the face drop and say, Oh. They lost X number of dollars because you're not a real negotiator. A lot of those situations come.

Our agency has dealt with a number of cases of hate crime and racial harassment, unfortunately, and that does happen. So the education of the community is very important. In a situation like Bridgeport where the increase has gone on so fast, a lot of people, even if they sell the house, they see that as a displacement. They're being forced out of it because there are more Chinese moving in and the family might feel that the price is right because they can sell it for double the price. Really, inside they're very unhappy with the fact that they have to move out. This is not to say that Bridgeport has painted such a negative picture, but we do have a number of problems there and we are actively working on it.

Also, positively in terms of prevention, we do try to run a number of programs. Through programs in our agency we infiltrate this whole scene of trying to promote racial harmony from our infants through the elderly program and it's really important.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Bridgeport, the mayor's former home, as Bernie has brought up and as I'm sure most of you know, has a history as a community and that history has not always been one of being, shall we say, open and hospitable to new people coming in. One wonders if communities sometimes get tagged with a history and then the population of the community changes and yet in the public mind, reinforced perhaps by media play over and over again, that old image persists. Jean, would you care to comment on that sort of thing?

JEAN MAYER: Well, being from the southwest side, I certainly can relate to your question. I'm from the southwest side and people expect you to either have a sheet on or wear horns or something like that. Most people really don't. The Marquette Park area is represented by the Southwest Federation and, of course, there is a history of confrontation in the park itself. Unfortunately, there was the spectacle of Dr. King being struck by a rock in 1966. Well, this was a long, long time ago and probably two-thirds of the people that lived there then are gone; but this image still persists. Before Christmas there was a fire bombing. A white homeowner moved in. I must tell those of you who aren't aware that that neighborhood has changed quite a bit. There are a lot of African-American families and some Hispanics, and some white people still there. They're trying to get along. They really are and for the most part they have succeeded very well, but a white family did move in before Christmas and they were fire bombed by some African-American youths. Of course, the TV stations jumped on this, as they love this sort of thing, and they dragged out all their old clips from the King march, from the Klan marches when they marched in Marquette Park. I'd like to say that the people that lived there at that time hated the Klan being there. They hated the fact the Nazis were there. The former Mayor Daley tried to get rid of them. He couldn't get rid of them. There was nothing to do, but that neighborhood is stuck with that image. Several of us did call up Channel 7 and complain about dragging these old clips in. We said, "Well, what's the purpose? This is like 30 years ago. For God sakes, people are trying to get along. Why are you doing this?" Well, this is history and this is news and people should know about it. Well, our response was, "Give people a break." Some people might be saying, "Well, the shoe is on the other foot now." In past times there was a history of white homeowners probably trying to confront African-Americans that moved in and now it's turned around.

One of the things that Sokoni mentioned was people really getting involved and I guess safety is certainly a very important public policy issue. Some of you may have read that our affiliate, the Marquette Park Community Association, has been successful in getting a program started to provide private security patrols for the area. Everybody worked on this and that kind of always confounds the politicians, particularly when you have all kinds of people going in together and working together. I think it's wonderful and I also think it makes the politicians nervous, because then they think they can't divide people. I go back 20 years ago to the old fight against FHA abuses and we ran what was called the Citizens Action Program Coalition. There were African-Americans and whites that used to go storm savings and loans and insurance companies. These people would go nuts because behind our backs they'd be saying something about us and behind the other people's back they'd talk about us, but we knew who the real enemy was.

Anyway, the group in Marquette Park put this issue on the ballot about a year and a half ago and it passed overwhelmingly. 75 percent of the people said they would be willing to tax themselves to provide for these private security patrols. Now, in this day and age that's pretty remarkable if people want to tax themselves. Besides, if a politician ever got 75% of the votes, we'd never hear the end of it. That is a mandate. They'd say 49% is a mandate or something. Well, I don't think so. The city dragged its feet on this. We went to the state. We got enabling legislation passed by the state legislature last fall to enable neighborhoods that want to do this to submit themselves to the referendum process and then be able to set up the security patrols and provide for a tax for their district.

I think things like this are really great. It shows that people can work together in spite of all these old historical pressures that neighborhoods were under. People are all the same no matter what color they are. They just want to live in peace and they want their kids to be able to go to school without getting beaten up.

Speaking of schools, Sokoni's group and the group we're affiliated with, the Save Our City Coalition, worked very hard to get school reform passed. There were many, many groups involved in this and we all came to the table with different ideas and maybe different reasons for being there, but we worked so hard. You can remember all the battles and the lobbying in Springfield, but we did it and school reform became a reality. It might not be the best thing in the world. It might not be working perfectly now, but at least it's a start and it gives us a base to work together.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Just picking up on what Jean had to say about Marquette Park, it might interest you that in the Sixties when Dr. King's marches occurred in Marquette Park, of the population of that area, 99 percent were white. In 1990, as Jean observed, the population has changed dramatically. It's now only 49 percent white, 24.1 percent African-American, and 24.8 percent Latino. This is a very integrated community area now. It's a very different kind of community area and yet, as Jean points out, the history of the community area still lives. The media still play upon that and to play upon that simply reinforces the old image and reinforces the old antagonisms.

While the rate of growth of the Latino community isn't quite as phenomenal as the rate of growth of the Asian-American community, in absolute numbers the Latino community is growing extremely fast and obviously putting pressure on the housing stock available in places where Latinos currently live and pushing outward. Millie Rivera, is this kind of movement creating some tension and problems?

MILLIE RIVERA: Certainly. Just to clarify, as you said, although the rate of growth is not as high as in the Asian community, the Hispanic community group was the only significant population group that grew during the 1980s -- in the city of Chicago that is. There was a significant drop in European-Americans. There was a significant drop amongst African-Americans as well. The answer to your question is, yes, there is a great deal of competition for space, but let me just say that it varies depending upon a variety of factors. As you eluded to in your earlier remarks, Paul, the fact is that there is a tendency to view populations or communities as monolithic. As many of you know, the Hispanic community or Latino community is certainly far from that. In fact, that's one of the differences right there. Some of us want to be called Hispanics and others Latino, and others want to be called by our national origin group -- Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban-American, etcetera.

Now in addition to that, some of the less obvious things that make us less than homogeneous are things that have to do with what was it that brought us to this country or what was it that made us part of something called the United States. Because to say "what brought us to this country" would ignore the fact that some of us were here before what is now called the United States was the United States. As many of you know, there are people who call themselves Hispanics or Latino who go back so many generations in the southwest of the United States before it was the United States, who are now being looked upon and pointed to as foreigners. Others of us have backgrounds in a Caribbean island called Puerto Rico, which is presently in a political relationship to the United States called a commonwealth, which gives U.S. citizenship the moment we're born. That is to say, we could run for the presidency and yet have second-class citizenship when it comes to treatment upon arriving on the mainland shores of the United States; because we are often confused for "foreigners" and therefore are asked for documentation upon employment. Because of our physical characteristics we are treated less than equal, if you will.

You look at a group that is called Hispanic or Latino, that what it has in common in large part is the way it is treated by the receiving country or the host country. Because, in fact, there are a great deal of differences between us and those differences include religious backgrounds. Among Mexican-Americans there's a preponderance of Catholicism and it permeates the culture; whereas in the Caribbean cultures, and in particular in Puerto Rico, it's upwards of twenty percent Protestant and there are a whole slew of varieties of Protestants in the Puerto Rican community. I talk about these two groups because they're the two largest national groups within the Hispanic community here in Chicago, although I might mention that upwards of twenty nations are represented in Chicago from Latin America in our community. Now, these differences are our national origin, our religion, the reasons why we came to the United States or are part of the United States, our citizenship status.

As I said, Puerto Ricans are natural-born citizens. None of the other national groups are and so those differences lead us to behave differently when faced with public policy issues. Let me just give you a couple of examples. One of them has to do with differences within our group and another one has to do with the expectations by outside groups regarding our group, the first of which is the issue of NAFTA. Many people expected the first and only Hispanic congress person from the city of Chicago to vote in favor of NAFTA. What a lot of people now know is that he did not. That is, Congressman Gutierrez did not vote in favor of NAFTA. Those same people often will say that the reason he did not was because, in fact, he favored labor and labor's position on the issue and that he perhaps gets a great deal of support or, if he hasn't, he will get a great deal of support from labor. I don't deny that in fact his position is congruent with the labor position, organized labor in the United States, and he probably will get a great deal of support in his next campaign from unions.

But what people don't understand is that Luis Gutierrez is a Puerto Rican and that there is a very, very rooted concern and profound concern amongst Puerto Ricans about what the effects of free trade have had on Puerto Rico and how that can become true in Mexico as well with so-called free trade; and that is the impact on the culture of Puerto Rico, because Puerto Rico's political relationship with the United States provides for free trade. That is, American corporations can go and set up shop in Puerto Rico at any point in time and import and export goods back and forth with a great deal of facility, which, in fact, is what NAFTA provides for with Mexico. That has impacted the culture of Puerto Rico tremendously.

That impact is something that Congressman Gutierrez has felt not only personally, but understands in a very global sense; because he has a great deal of concern for his native island and projects it onto Mexico and, in fact, was quoted recently in a Spanish language media stating the fact that his very significant concern was for the culture of Mexico and the effects of the workers in Mexico. Now, that's an intra-group issue that we struggle with because, in fact, many, many Latinos did support NAFTA. Now, I might add that it's interesting to see that some of the differences on it were also class based and they were not national origin based. The business sector in our community supported NAFTA. The worker or laborer or blue collar person, did not.

Now, an issue that you can see a significant difference in in our community that comes from the outside looking in in terms of the expectations is the whole issue of re-districting. While this seems to be some time back, the fact of the matter is that the re-districting of the city of Chicago's wards is still in court. The Mexican-American Legal & Education Defense Fund did challenge the map that was approved by referendum that the city proposed and has been adopted as a result of the referendum, but it's being challenged and it will probably go to trial this spring. That process, the re-districting process, put the Latino community at odds not only within itself, but certainly with other groups. I think most notably the African-American community and the Latino community had the potential to go to real serious blows over this issue. Part of it has to do with the fact that the African-American community, and rightly so, understands that they were the ones who fought long and hard for the Voting Rights Act.

There is a sense, and I think that it's legitimate in a significant way, that the Voting Rights Act, having been fought by one group, should not provide benefits to another group at the expense of the one who fought for it. So the notion of the Hispanic community coming in, as some people have called us, Johnny come lately to this issue and riding on the coattails of an African-American community who has fought long and hard for political empowerment to then get political representation, and as a result of it the African-American community ending up with less, was clearly something that could lead to serious conflict and in fact led to some very interesting negotiation sessions in basements of a lot of lawyers in this city. What I'm happy to say is that some of the things that may look like differences amongst us in fact were not differences and we were able to use them to come to some at least amicable agreement to disagree. It was not a consensus about how many wards or how many congressional districts or where the lines should be drawn, but we understand that the media can and will and in fact did on occasion use this issue to try to divide us. We tried to keep many of the negotiations under wraps as much as possible in order not to flame that fire, because it had serious possibilities.

PAUL KLEPPNER: You've made a number of important points, some of which I want to come back to. I think you talked about some internal diversity within the Latino community. You said, for example, with regard to NAFTA you have to look at, to explain Congressman Gutierrez's vote, national origin differences. You've talked also about class differences. I think you suggested that the way the Latino community is treated by the receiving society and also the way it's portrayed I think in the media and in the press creates an illusion of homogeneity that just isn't there. I think that's something that's a very important and I'd like the other panelists to comment on. Jean, for example. I work largely in political history and so I tend to see the reference to white ethnics in the city as though this were some homogenous group just waiting out there to be mobilized at the drop of a hat. Do you care to comment?

JEAN MAYER: Well, that's not really true. We have a diverse population among the white ethnic people on the southwest side. There is a very heavy concentration of Polish people where I live. When my family moved in, several people looked at me and said, "You're not Polish?" I said, "Gosh, no. I'm sorry, but I'm not." There are a lot of Lithuanian people that live in the Marquette Park area. There's a homeowners group there that absolutely fought tooth and nail against every program that the Southwest Federation ever suggested, and this goes back 22 years. The funny thing is one of our staff people commented to Alderman Virgil Jones from the Fifteenth Ward, who is an African-American, that his community gets along a lot better with the Lithuanians than the white ethnics did. One of our parishes, and I won't name it, but awhile back, especially the population was sort of divided between Italians and Irish, and they were feuding all the time really about who was going to control the church societies and who was going to have the most people on boards at the church. It's just like as you were talking about in your community. Just because we might be white ethnics, it doesn't mean that we all march to the same drummer, so to speak.

PAUL KLEPPNER: But a lot of this gets lost as the media presents the story.

JEAN MAYER: Yes, we're just one big lump.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Sokoni, do you care to comment on the internal diversity within the African-American community and the history of that?

SOKONI KARANJA: Yes. There's a lot of diversity in the African-American community of Chicago. It's always lost because we are portrayed generally as poor and as violent, at least in the media, but there are a lot of differences of opinion. We've got all kinds of different groups. We've got Jamaicans. We've got Ghanaians. We've got Nigerians. We've got upper income. We've got lower income. We've got middle income. We've got Baptists. We've got Methodists. We've got Apostolics. We've got all the different kinds of groups in our community and we have different opinions. Those opinions we argue among ourselves rather intensely. We explore problems in a great deal of depth. We have a lot of diversity that we experience, but generally that's not known.

The perception in the community is that it is one black block that is basically poor and violent. I often tell the story that I know often the perceptions of many white women in particular, because when I enter the elevator with them they immediately grab their purses. Sometimes I tease them and tell them I'm not doing that today so that they understand that I understand their misperceptions. Not all African-American men are into that, but that is so often the perception that is painted by the media. If you just look at the media constantly, you get a sense that the African community is like the most violent place that you could ever be. But just come with me. Come with me to the community with the highest concentration of people living below the level of poverty in the United States. I can walk down any street. I will not be shot at. Nobody will beat me up. If you are white, I probably will be safer walking down that street because there is that kind of stepping aside in our community. There is a lot of diversity and I know it's so in the other communities, and it's very important that people understand that as far as our community is concerned.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Bernie, what about the Asian-American community?

BERNIE WONG: The Asian-American community probably is the largest diverse group in terms of numbers. In the 1990 census, there are at least 25 different groups that have been reported. Sometimes I tease my friends and say, "How many Asian groups are there?" They can count three or four. Generally they think about the Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans as probably the three older groups and then they may think about the Vietnamese because they know about the Vietnam War. That's the extent that many of the people seem to go, but there is a large diversity in the Asian community. There are seventeen different Asian-American groups and another eight or so of Pacific Islanders and that, of course, is even less known, especially in the midwest area. On the west coast it's a little bit better known, but there is a lot of diversity. We think differently. Many of our customs are very different, even though in a lot of sense we like to present ourselves as an Asian block for various reasons. On the other hand, we like people to know that there are a lot of differences.

I think there is very little understanding in terms of the Asian community and therefore very little sensitivity to a lot of things. I was just talking to a counterpart of mine in Los Angeles and she was telling me about an incident in Los Angeles where there was an owner of a cemetery/mortuary business who does a lot of business with the Chinese and with good intentions he thinks he would like to bring the business closer to the community. He decided to buy up blocks of land in Los Angeles right in the Chinatown area, closer to the Chinatown area, to build a cemetery. Those of you who know the Asian community know that we respect the process of death and dying, but once people die there is a lot of fear and suspicion of the dead. The spirit comes back to you, especially if they were not satisfied with their life while they were here. They'll come back and really haunt the living. No business would want a mortuary or a funeral home right next to their business, so there were a lot of businesses that went up in arms and the owner couldn't understand. There was a lot of fear and people losing sleep over it, the owners, and they wanted to move away. They literally just wanted to pack up their business and leave because a funeral parlor was coming next to them. If you just asked one Asian person, or had one Asian person in on your planning, you would know. It's just that kind of understanding and sensitivity that's very important.

It repeats itself on a daily basis. Going back to what Sokoni was saying in the elevator, we have this all the time. I have people come up to me and say, "Do you speak

English?" It's very hard because we wear our heritage on our face. It's really hard for them to know whether I'm a new immigrant or not a new immigrant. Even with new immigrants, even if they speak limited English, they still feel very sensitive when people come to them and ask them a question like that; so I think that's very important.

SOKONI KARANJA: One thing, Bernie. They don't ask us any questions.

BERNIE WONG: We tend to get a lot of questions. I remember when I first came to college. We'd get questions every day. We'd get invitations to people's homes because they wanted to ask us questions. They wanted to understand our culture. I think it's nice, but then you get tired of that after awhile.

The other thing I want to mention in terms of the diversity is what you mentioned earlier about animosity between groups. There are a number of tensions between Asian groups too, for some of the Chinese. For example, the older Chinese, they will not buy a Japanese car because of the tension of World War II, and not only older. Some of my friends wouldn't. I could talk to them until I'm blue in the face and they say, "No way, I'm not buying a Japanese car." There is still a lot of tension there. Some of the Chinese do have very strong and active feelings about some Vietnamese, for example, because many of the Chinese were very successful businessmen in Vietnam and had been driven away from Vietnam. I think when people approach the Asian community they need to understand some of those factors and be real sensitive to that.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Before I ask another question, let me remind any of you in the audience that if you want to participate and ask a question of any of the panelists or make a comment, please just appear behind one of the microphones.

AUDIENCE QUESTION. I'm Roslyn Lieb. I'm Director of the Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights. We've been involved with a lot of the different groups that make up our city. I think that a lot of the current problems tend to revolve around diminishing resources and a fight over what hopefully will be more at some time in the future. However, I think our experience has been that we have witnessed, and I'd like to hear from other people on the panel. What kinds of additional positive experiences have there been in the past as far as, for example, the congressional re-map is concerned? Those in power very often were pitting one group, particularly the Latino, against the African-American groups and negotiating separately and saying, "We'll help you and we'll help you," and not really wanting to help anyone. Starting awhile back, there was a recognition among the leadership of both groups that in working together there would be tremendous strength in numbers, and we have seen a change in how the congressional re-map was drawn. Are there other examples of more recent experiences of working together and drawing on that strength in numbers?

PAUL KLEPPNER: Jean talked before about the cooperation with Sokoni's group and others on school reform. What about some other examples?

JEAN MAYER: Just to say one thing on school reform. As I said, I think people came to the table with maybe different agendas, different reasons for being there, but their underlying goal and their underlying concern was the children. These are innocent children. They shouldn't be burdened with baggage that our groups have to deal with or things that our grandparents did or whatever. That was one way that people were able to put aside all the old hostilities or suspicions and just focus on doing what was right for the children because, as I said, they're innocent and they don't really deserve bad treatment just because of what their parents or their grandparents did. Our group has worked very successfully in coalitions with African-American groups and Hispanic groups on crime problems. Several years ago, we were all getting police statistics on a regular basis from our local police stations. This goes back to Jane Byrne, but when she was mayor she said, "No way." Richard Brzeczek was the Police Superintendent and no way are you getting these. So we got together and we had a meeting down at St. Pious one day. We had about 700 people from all parts of the city. We got our police statistics back, which just shows that if people will put aside whatever differences they might have to look at a common goal and focus on one issue that's of concern to them, you can beat City Hall.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Jean, I think your point is a good one that the people that you were dealing with put uppermost in their minds the well-being of the children of the city of Chicago who are educated in the public school system, but I wonder how extensive that feeling is in some communities. For example, when I looked at the vote on the 1992 education amendment in the city of Chicago, lo and behold, the areas of the city where it had the least support were exactly where I would have predicted that they were in a sense--Ward 23, Ward 19, the white precincts of the Twelfth Ward, the Fourteenth Ward, places of that sort with relatively low levels of support for more funding for public education. How do you respond to that kind of thing?

JEAN MAYER: I think probably the ordinary citizen, like myself, in those wards probably would be in favor of that.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Is it a leadership issue?

JEAN MAYER: I know the wards that you're mentioning. I think in other wards there was probably an involvement by the local ward organization or whoever to try and get out the vote. Stuff like that doesn't always happen on worthwhile issues like that. In my neighborhood, they're more concerned about getting their candidate elected for governor. They'll pick one and the precinct captain will come around and say, "Well, give me so-and-so," and they don't even mention things like that. A lot of people are very busy. They don't have a lot of time to read newspapers. They watch TV and they get their news from that. A lot of people are just not aware of things like this that are on the ballot or even happening. I know people should be, but with today's pressures it's just the way it is, I think. If there's not the leadership coming, oftentimes things like that don't.

PAUL KLEPPNER: So what you're saying is that it's really a leadership kind of issue and there's a need for someone to articulate that kind of position and inform them.

JEAN MAYER: Well, on any issue. I mentioned the Marquette Park security. People went out and talked to people about that. You have to educate people on issues before they can respond or they don't know about them.

PAUL KLEPPNER: Sokoni, you wanted to say something.

SOKONI KARANJA: Yes. Going forward, I don't know of any other incidents, but I'm sure there are places where cooperation has occurred, but going forward one of the major issues facing this city and this state is how we're going to fund the state and how we're going to fund education. If there is not cooperation among every group sitting in this room, we're going to have a state not only that is in the back water as far as providing education, but also in terms of just basic funding for any services. That going forward needs all kinds of leadership. The Urban League has been taking the lead, but it needs to have the Civic Committee -- and I see Larry Howe sitting back there--and everybody involved in that process in order to make that kind of change.

PAUL KLEPPNER: But isn't that undercut somewhat by politicians striving for office who immediately come out and say no new taxes, as one did yesterday, that we can solve this funding problem, and he will go unnamed, but we can solve this problem over a six-year period rather than the other proposal for an immediate income tax increase?

SOKONI KARANJA: I think that politicians are voted in. They are responsible to the citizenry and what we ought to be about is figuring out what is in the best interest of the children of the state of Illinois. Right now, they are really being seriously negatively impacted by the lack of resources available for education. Unless we are serious as citizens to take on this task, we are going to face a situation where we can't even employ a dishwasher because he will not be capable of reading the computer that will allow him to wash the dishes.

AUDIENCE QUESTION. Good morning. My name is Rudy Harper. I work with a neighborhood group on the southwest side of Chicago. I'm happy that the Urban League sponsored this affair because I think race relations has not been a fundable item in many, many years in Chicago. I think based upon what's happening in Joliet and Aurora, around the metropolitan area of Chicago race relations should be a fundable item. I'd like to commend Mr. Compton and his able assistant, Jim Eldridge, for sponsoring this affair and the Board of the Urban League. Dr. Kleppner and panelists, good morning.

I'd like to ask the panelists a question. When Latino legislators in Springfield endorse a change of the pension fund for CTA which pits Latino legislators against a heavily dominated black employee CTA union, is that a matter of race? When the Board of

Education decides to concentrate one ethnic group in one particular area and build and construct new schools but prefers not to fund truant officers which enable students to get to school and which enables parents to keep them in school and, more important, something that was done in a book by one of my professors years ago, Ed Marciniak, who is ill right now, in his book, *Tomorrow's Christian*, he says that any Christian, if they wish to demonstrate racial tolerance and to evade any notion of discriminatory attitudes, should not belong to any country club, private club that espouses racial attitudes, but we endorse a candidate for governor who did belong to a country club that even refused to allow women on the parking lot, along with the fact that we have major institutions in Chicago that reject applicants for mortgage lending three and four to one in our midst, should we in our work spend time to invest in race relations and communicate as best we possibly can with our existing groups? Should we add another program on to our agenda to address race relations as it affects public policy?

MILLIE RIVERA: I'm going to take your last question first, because I think it really will cut across a lot of what I would have responded to most of your questions. Should we add another program? I think that would be disastrous. I think what we all have to be about is having all of our programs having that element first and foremost as part of the design. It's an interesting thing. When the city of Chicago's educational system was faced with a population -- and that's not just an Hispanic population but certainly among Asians and Polish-Americans, etcetera -- who had linguistic problems -- and not only in the city of Chicago but the state of Illinois -- it enacted a bilingual education act. What it did was it relegated. The way it was implemented was that it relegated all the problems of that population to a separate program, to a separate office. If somebody had a special education need and they happened to have linguistic barriers, the problem was immediately sent to the bilingual office or the multi-lingual office and now the language and culture office.

I think any governmental body or any responsible institution that attempts to address any problem in a society by adding another program, and a problem that is so profound, that permeates everything that we do, because I do and I would answer in the affirmative to you. I do believe that there is an element of racism in each and every instance that you mentioned. I cannot say for certain. I cannot get in the minds and hearts of the legislators and in particular the Latino legislators who were involved in that particular piece of legislation. I don't know the motivation of all the people that were involved in all of these public policy decision processes. What I do know from my personal experience is that each and every time I've been involved in a major policy decision in the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois, I have detected, if not overt racism, certainly subtle racism. It's there. It is alive and well, and I know that's an overworn word.

Having answered that, if I may just take the opportunity to mention a couple of positive examples in response to your question which I think will give us some hope in the face of the fact that racism is alive and well--and that is this building we're sitting in right here. This building we're sitting in was built by AT&T. They contracted Stein & Company to build it. In letting out the contracts for building this building, they set aside just phenomenal goals for including minority and women. In that process we could have ended up with the African-American community and the Latino community at odds with each other. Instead, the Black United Business Contractors and the Hispanic-American Contracting Industry Association sat together and hammered out some very, very good working relationships with Stein & Company and AT&T. I consider that one of the major successes in the private sector in this city, which gives me a great deal of optimism. I'd like to see that happen over and over again, and it's my compliment. I'm not trying to be gratuitous in that we're sitting in this room and there are representatives of AT&T, but in fact AT&T has taken a lead often on many of these issues and I do compliment them in that; because they were very present in those negotiations, as well as CHA.

Now mind you, as Sokoni mentioned, the upcoming issue in the public policy in this state that is of major concern to all of us is education, but I might mention a couple of other things that are coming down the pike. So far, the Latino community has been able to sit down with Vince Lane regarding, while not in theory, certainly in practice, the discrimination against Latinos in terms of accessing public housing. Now, some people will say who wants to live in public housing. Why do you want access to that? Well, the fact of the matter is that there is a deteriorating housing stock in this city and in particular on the south side. No, nobody wants to live in deteriorating high-rises, "crime ridden," etcetera, but we know that there are some exciting things happening in some of those projects. We also know that public housing is not limited only to those high-rise units, but there is scattered site housing. In fact, the Gautreaux decision of 20-some years ago which provided for scattered site housing paid for through public dollars is something that is being looked at and we're trying to negotiate the implementation of; because a lot of the scattered site housing right now is being built in what some people call white communities, but in fact they have a plurality of Latinos in it and so it's building up a potential for serious conflict between the African-American community and the Latino community.

Hopefully we'll be able to deal with this, as we've dealt with a couple of other things in the past between the two communities and it not lead to something ugly. But I think the most important thing in most of these things is that those of you who are in the media, don't print it, and those of you who are not, don't tell the media; because the moment the media begins to look at these issues, unfortunately they tend to do it superficially and we've got to spend time with our communities educating them before it hits the fan, as they say.

PAUL KLEPPNER: The panelists in this morning at various points have pointed to the various times, have pointed to the role that the media plays and the role that some politicians play. I guess what I would like to ask each of the panelists to comment on is, given that the media can present an image which is negative to good or improved relations, what would you do, and the politicians often do the same thing, what positive things would you suggest be done in order to avert that kind of presentation? Sokoni?

SOKONI KARANJA: Well, as I look at the situation and I look at what happened in 1966, I was not in Chicago then but looking back at that and reading historically, I don't see perceptibly in terms of attitude anyway any substantive difference in the place of racism in the interaction between groups. There's certainly cooperation among leadership and we work together in crisis situations. The major problem I think we face is that we never really finished that civil rights struggle, and we really need to have a coalition of groups coming together to take this on, take some of these issues on in a very direct way. We have basically stated in our action that it doesn't work any more. But the problems are so large and particularly the problem of funding of the schools, the problem of what is happening to our kids. I mean our kids are being devastated, and yet we're seeing it turned around on them and we're saying these kids are so violent and we're not looking at the violence that is perpetrating their violence, and we need to have people coming together to begin to challenge this system to provide the kind of resources, the kind of community where kids can grow up and feel safe. The reason kids are acting violent is because they're in a violent society that is constantly acting violently against them, and we don't have the leadership in our city that is coming together to challenge that in any kind of meaningful way, and I think that the media is just one part of that group of instruments that is perpetuating this kind of sickness of saying that the victim is responsible for the condition that he is encountering. And so I think that's where we have to go.

JEAN MAYER: Well, I think the media is in large part responsible for a lot of our problems not solely because in a large part they report what they see, but they do tend to sensationalize. A couple of years ago, we had a press conference and this group of Nazis wanted to march in Marquette Park, they always pick Marquette Park. And so we called the press together for a press conference and there was all kinds of people. There were people from the Urban League there, I think Jim Compton might have been there, I'm not sure, but there were people from all our neighborhood groups and from groups all over the city and we all to a person condemned this and I had people say to me, oh, that was wonderful what you did, how you changed, and I said, well, we haven't changed. Our group has been saying these same things for years, but the media never really portrays people truly and we said to these reporters and a lot of them really had their feathers ruffled, we said, hey, you guys, talk to the real people and pay attention to what's going on, do a little in depth digging and don't be so superficial and don't let the politicians just be pitting people against each other. Dig around and find out how people really are.

BERNIE WONG: I think in terms of the media for the Asian community here, this last few years there's been formed an Asian American journalist association and that has been very helpful. They take a very active role in talking to the various media, and particularly promoting more hiring of Asians in those particular areas and has been very helpful. Also, I'm very pleased that lately there's been a number of movies that depict the positive sides of many of the Asian Americans, and hopefully you all take advantage of that. I'm very pleased that that seems to be a moving forward in the movie industry. I just want to mention there's a booklet by the National Conference of Jews and Christians that talks about the Asian population, and there's a segment on tips for the media at what they should be watching out to present the positive side of the Asian American community so you can look into that. I want to mention as a point, Dr. King is not just a black civil rights leader in our working and Millie is right in terms of the race relations needing to permeate through all the programs in our agency. We really try very hard in every program to try to promote race relations, and one of the things that I tell the young people is that in the early 1960s and I have some friends that actually came in late 1950 some, they were sitting in the back of the bus too and it wasn't just the blacks. And if it wasn't for Dr. King, I think the Asian community would not be at the level that we are at now so I do want to recognize that.

In terms of hope, I'm very pleased talking to my counterparts nationally. Many of them in other cities really do not have the type of networking that we have among the various groups. In Chicago, much of our leadership knows each other. The people on this panel, I think we've talked and sit on a lot of different committees, and I think that's very helpful geographically if people really know each other and respect each other, and I think it's very helpful that we can move forward in many of our agendas without feeling that we need to be competing against each other.

MILLIE RIVERA: Although I set forth the notion that there shouldn't be a specific program but things should permeate everything, I would say that the issue of racism and how to deal with racism is something that should indeed permeate the design of any program or they should be part and parcel of activities all the time, but that should be the goal. I think in the interim, there is a need for funding of specific interventions that educate us, give us an opportunity to educate ourselves about not only the differences between us but the commonalities, not only the successes and failures of the past but the pending challenges, precisely what we're trying to do here. I mean I don't know what kind of flexibility your respective employers have to give you the time or for you to have taken the time to be sitting here today, but how many people in our society have that kind of time? This is not something that we had an opportunity to do from the cradle. We're trying to play catch up here as a society, not just us in this room, we're probably the converted. We're talking about lots of folks out there who have very little notion, I mean they have a sense that there's something wrong, they have a sense that something's missing, that there's a gap in their knowledge base and perhaps their experience base. They don't know how to get it filled or where. And so programs that provide an opportunity for people to educate their work force, to educate their community and the people on the street about the differences and the commonalities, I think are very much needed in our community, and I would start with the schools of journalism.

PAUL KLEPPNER: A good starting point. I think you can see that there have been opportunities, there have been occasions here in this city in the recent past at any rate in which despite the potential for group antagonism, the groups have been able to work things out and work out an accommodation. There are also, as several of the panelists have pointed out, ongoing structures or ongoing institutions like contractors associations and other organizations through which this kind of mutual cooperation can continue to be encouraged. Those are very positive signs and the kinds of things that we should work for, work to improve and proliferate in the future. And with that, let me take the opportunity to thank the panelists for participating this morning and to thank you for your attendance and attention.

PANEL II

STRUCTURE OF RACIAL SEGREGATION AND POVERTY

DOUGLAS MASSEY

It's a pleasure to be here on this anniversary week of Martin Luther King's birth because the issue I want to address today is one that Dr. King was turning to in his latter years, and that is the issue of segregation in U.S. society.

I recently wrote a book in collaboration with Nancy Denton at the State University of New York at Albany entitled *American Apartheid* which sought to make the case that residential segregation of African Americans is a principal factor behind the disadvantages and poverty that black Americans face and behind the disintegrated state of American cities, and a principal factor for what's come to be called the rise of the urban under class. My argument basically has three parts, first, that black segregation is unique, unparalleled and very high, second, the causes of this segregation are neither past nor involuntary, and third, if a group is involuntarily segregated on the basis of the color of its skin, then a number of very serious consequences follow.

Let's begin with the first argument, the nature of black segregation in U.S. society. It is a fact that no group in the history of the United States has ever been as segregated as black Americans are now and have been for the past eighty years in American cities. It is historically unprecedented and contemporaneously unparalleled. Historically, if you go back to the period 1880 to 1920, when black populations and urban areas were beginning to grow and when European ethnic groups were being formed through a process of immigration from abroad, you find that the way that the European immigrants and the black migrants were received in American cities was entirely different, and their paths of spatial incorporation were entirely different. When European ethnic groups arrived in the city, they did cluster to some extent in ethnic enclaves but those ethnic enclaves were never homogenous, they were never permanent, and they were very permeable. When blacks arrived in American cities, they were channeled into enclaves that were homogenous, surrounded by impermeable barriers that were deliberately confining.

There is a myth that other groups entered American cities, were segregated into homogenous immigrant enclaves, improved themselves economically and then moved out. It never happened that way. For every group that has ever entered American cities with the exception of black Americans, social and residential mobility were part and parcel of the same underlying process and in fact, reinforced one another. The groups that arrived in U.S. cities were never completely segregated to the extent that they were in low income or ethnic enclaves. When they moved up the economic ladder, they translated those economic gains into residential gains and by moving up the residential ladder, they put themselves in a better position to move up the economic ladder and over time, ratcheted themselves up.

For black Americans, this path of mobility was foreclosed by deliberate actions on the part of individuals, institutions and organs of government. Individuals harassed and systemically excluded blacks who sought to live in the whiter housing market. Institutions of government deliberately put forth policies to confine blacks to certain neighborhoods, and other institutions exercised high levels of discrimination against black home seekers outside of prescribed black areas. As a result, when you use a typical index of segregation which varies from zero to 100 with zero meaning no segregation and 100 maximum segregation, if you look at European ethnic groups, their rates of segregation vary between about thirty and sixty. When they're as high as sixty, that proved to be a very transitory level of segregation and across the generations and as economic status advanced, levels of segregation progressively fell until by now the European groups, in the words of one sociologist, are moving into the twilight of ethnicity.

Black segregation levels began at relatively low levels like European ethnic groups right after the Civil War but as black populations increased, levels of higher segregation were imposed and the ghetto was created as a fundamental institution of American life until by 1920 in cities with substantial black populations such as Chicago, levels of segregation reached 90 and above, and there they sat. From 1920 to 1930 to 1940 to 1950 to 1960 to 1970, the level of segregation in Chicago stood at about ninety. In 1980, it dropped down to 88, and in 1990, it stands at 87. So in other words, for the past eighty to 100 years there has been no significant change in the level of black segregation.

If you compare blacks with Hispanics and Asians in American cities today, their levels of segregation look very much like those that we observed for other European ethnic groups before. They're variable from city to city, and the degree of variability reflects histories of immigration and socioeconomic mobility.

So black segregation is utterly unique in American history and unprecedented. No group has ever experienced these levels before and it is just incomparable. What causes this segregation? Well, I think the answers are three, first, the persistence of prejudice on the part of white Americans towards the prospect of sharing neighborhoods with black people, second, high levels of discrimination that persist in U.S. housing markets and in the lending industry, and third, the actions of government itself.

If you look at attitudinal data and ask a representative sample of white people, should people be able to live wherever they want to regardless of race? Almost 90% of white respondents now say yes. In principle, they accept the idea of an open housing market. Yet if you ask the same panel of people, would you vote for a law that said it was illegal to discriminate against the home seeker on the basis of race, only about 46 percent or 47 percent would vote for such a law, even though it is in fact the law of the land and has been since 1968, which indicates a discrepancy between the acceptance of open housing in principle and its acceptance in practice. And if you probe further and ask a sample of white respondents how they would feel, not what they think, but how they feel about the prospect of sharing a neighborhood with black people, you find that the percentage of white respondents who say they feel uncomfortable, would try to leave, or refuse to enter, rises as sharply as the percentage of blacks in the hypothetical neighborhood increases. At about a third black, a majority of white respondents would feel uncomfortable, try to leave or refuse to enter. And at a fifty-fifty mixture, vast majorities of white respondents would feel uncomfortable, refuse to enter, or would try to leave.

If you look at black attitudes, they strongly endorse the principle of integration. Ninety-nine percent believe people should be able to live wherever they want to regardless of race, 99 percent would vote for such a law to guarantee that principle, and when asked how they feel about the prospect of living in integrated neighborhoods, the most preferred neighborhood composition is a fifty-fifty racial mixture by a substantial margin. But even though that's the most preferred, they express a great degree of tolerance and willingness to live in any neighborhood composition that ranges from about five percent to about sixty percent black. And paradoxically above sixty percent black, it is our ability the neighborhood falls off, and one of the least desired compositions is 100 percent black according to black respondents and opinion polls.

So what you see here is a difference in the trajectory of demand. Black demand for a neighborhood surges as it becomes integrated, and actually rises as the integration moves towards fifty percent. White demand is very strong for all white neighborhoods, and then falls as the percentage of black in the neighborhood increases. The disparity in demands fuels a process in neighborhood transition.

Now this is a classic tipping point model, and many people leave the story there. But I think it is wrong to leave the story at that because the tipping point model makes a number of implicit assumptions, the most important of which is that it assumes that there exists some kind of discriminatory mechanism to keep black people out of most neighborhoods because if blacks are moving into your neighborhood and you're white and you don't like it, it assumes there are lots of other places you can go and you can reasonably be assured that black people will not be in those neighborhoods.

So the second piece of the puzzle is discrimination, and here recent studies carried out by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development have confirmed that high levels of discrimination against black home seekers persist in American real estate markets. These are surveys begun under the Reagan administration and carried to fruition under the Bush administration and released by Secretary Jack Kemp at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Because they were carried out by an administration that would probably just as soon have not found high levels of discrimination, I think that they acquire a great deal of credibility. What they found was that earlier attempts to measure the level of discrimination in U.S. housing markets, while they suffered from a number of methodological flaws, were substantially correct. And not only were they substantially correct but to the extent that the methodological problems created biases, they tended to understate the severity of discrimination. And in fact, the odds that a black home seeker would experience some kind of treatment that would systemically reduce the availability of housing compared to a comparable white person, ranged from sixty to ninety percent on any given encounter.

Recent studies carried out by Fannie Mae, the Federal National Mortgage Association, by the Federal Reserve system and by a number of newspapers and a few academics have also shown that there are large gaps that are unexplained by any kind of objective criteria we can think of, large gaps in the rate at which blacks and whites are rejected for home mortgages. Again this story initially broke in the early 1980's under the Reagan administration when the Federal Reserve District of Boston sought to carry out research to show that once you controlled for everything, these differentials and rejection rates between blacks and whites essentially disappeared, that's what they wanted to find out. Everything they put in their statistical models, everything they tried to control for, could not get rid of this gap which was about two to one. And this was embarrassing so they sat on it, and then somebody leaked it to the *New York Times* and then it became public. Since then a number of investigations have found essentially the same thing using progressively more sophisticated models and controls.

Not only does the gap extend to individuals on the basis of race, it also extends to neighborhoods. A number of studies have demonstrated, using data that are made available through acts of Congress that require it, that neighborhoods that contain black residents do not receive their fair share of mortgage monies. That is, if you develop a model that allocates mortgages on the basis of market indicators and then apply it, you find that black neighborhoods are always under what you would expect on the basis of the market model and nothing can really explain that gap. So there appear to be, given our best information, high levels of discrimination against black home seekers in U.S. housing markets and U.S. lending markets that persist to this day.

The third piece of the puzzle is the actions of government. Far from being a neutral observer of these trends over the past sixty to eighty years, the federal, state and local governments have at key junctures intervened forcefully to promote segregation and perpetuate the ghetto. Redlining itself was more an invention of the federal government than the private lending sector. If it wasn't invented by the federal government, at least it was institutionalized and perpetuated by the federal government.

The federal government in the 1930s and then in the 1940s under the FHA created a requirement that to receive an FHA approved loan, not only the person and the home had to be inspected and receive approval, but the neighborhood also had to pass a test and they developed a series of maps called residential security maps that color coded neighborhoods according to their credit worthiness. And the bottom category was red.

A black neighborhood automatically received a red rating. And not only black neighborhoods, but any neighborhood that was thought to be in danger of at some point in the future getting black residents so that neighborhoods that were adjacent to the black neighborhoods were redlined. And any place that blacks had expressed any kind of interest or behavior in moving towards were coded red. So it became true that any neighborhood that was black or likely to be black was cut off from FHA mortgage monies. You could not get an FHA approved mortgage if you were coded red. It was impossible.

The private lending industry took its cue from the federal government and essentially what we had was a situation that persisted from the 1940s through the early 1980s at least, and probably still today, whereby you have taken a group of people, segregated them, cut off the supply of capital into those neighborhoods and the neighborhoods go downhill, and there is no other outcome that is possible.

The federal government required as a condition of receiving an FHA loan that properties be covered by a racially restrictive covenant that stated that the home could not be rented or resold to blacks, and that was a requirement in the FHA underwriter's manual until 1951. It was only removed under threat of litigation because three years earlier in 1948, the Supreme Court had declared racially restrictive covenants to be unconstitutional.

One other illustration of government's role, and there are many others, is the way that the government employed public housing and urban renewal together in an effort to reinforce the walls of the ghetto. With black migration from the rural south into northern cities, black neighborhoods were expanding very rapidly and inevitably in many cities around the country, they began to expand towards certain districts where a number of white interests had sunk investments. This was perceived as a threat, a threat that the private sector powers as immense as they were, could not solve. So the private sector turned to the organs of government, got urban renewal legislation that gave development authorities the right to buy land at market rates, clear it, and sell it back to developers at a subsidized price for conversion to institutional and middle class uses. So what happened was in areas of expanding ghettos that were encroaching on threatened institutions, urban renewal authorities were set up to redevelop the area, the land was purchased at market prices, razed and converted to middle class institutional uses.

The urban renewal legislation contained a one for one rule that said for every unit of housing destroyed, you had to create another unit, and so this is where public housing came in. Government employed public housing as a tool for satisfying the one to one requirement, and this required building public housing for low income black people that you've displaced and razing the neighborhood that's threatening the white district.

Where were public housing projects to house low income black people built? Cities like Chicago and other areas around the country all had aldermanic vetoes. Essentially you could not build projects in areas where the representative said he did not want it. So projects were built in the old core of the black belt, except now you had to tear down another neighborhood and now you needed enough public housing to house two sets worth of neighborhoods worth of people in one parcel of land. This resulted in the corridor of public housing stretching from 35th Street in the north to Garfield Boulevard in the south, the largest single concentration of public housing in the United States, which not only isolates blacks by race, but also perpetuates a new, dangerous and unprecedented level of isolation by class.

The housing markets only produce poverty concentrations of fifty or sixty percent at the most. It takes intervention by the federal government to get concentrations of poverty in the range of ninety percent. And again, the fact that this was done as a deliberate strategy to segregate black people, to reinforce the patterns of segregation in Chicago is not the conclusion of Doug Massey alone. It is the conclusion of a number of historians and the conclusions of the U.S. federal courts who have held Chicago Housing Authority and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to be culpable in discriminatorily citing public housing projects and in using them as a tool of segregation.

If segregation of blacks is unique, if it was created deliberately by whites in a self-conscious attempt to isolate and geographically restrict black people, if this segregation were voluntarily perpetuated through discrimination in realty and banking industries abetted by the actions of the federal and local and state governments, then a number of serious deleterious consequences follow for black Americans. Segregation undermines black welfare at the individual level because, as I said earlier, residential mobility is part and parcel of a process of social mobility. Barriers to residential mobility translate in a very direct way into barriers to social mobility. Most people don't move into white neighborhoods because they want to be near Anglo whites. Mexicans that come into Chicago do not seek to move out of Pilsen Little Village because they want to live near a bunch of people who speak English and eat white bread. They move for other reasons. They move because they want better schools and safer streets. They want to buy into a segment of the housing market where home equities are likely to increase and home values are likely to rise, they want lower insurance rates, they want a peer group for their kids where the expectation is college and not unemployment. So to get access to these benefits and resources, they move. And by moving, they put themselves and their children in a better position to move further ahead.

Barriers to residential mobility are barriers to social mobility because they cut off this mobility process for a group of people on the basis of the color of their skin, and you do not need to posit a desire for integration for integration to occur. The only thing you need to posit is a desire for other benefits and resources that are scattered widely around metropolitan areas and are never found in one place, and a willingness to put up with living near white people in order to get access to these things. So a group that does not have residential mobility does not have access to the full range of benefits, goods and services of American society because we in the society have chosen markets to distribute goods and services.

One of the most important markets is housing markets because housing markets not only distribute a place to live, they distribute anything that is correlated with where you live. So housing markets also end up distributing education, safety, exposure to crime and violence, insurance rates, and wealth in the form of home equity. All these things get distributed through markets and if you don't have access to the market, then you don't have access to all those other things.

Segregation also undermines black welfare at the group level by concentrating poverty geographically. If you segregate a group and drive up its rate of poverty, you get geographically concentrated poverty. There is no other outcome that is possible, and that is exactly what has happened to black Americans.

During the 1970s and 1980s, we experienced a wave of factory closings, decline in the real value of welfare payments, a lot of economic instability, rising joblessness -- things that affected all Americans. They affected Latinos in the city of Chicago as well as blacks, but Latinos don't live in areas of concentrated poverty for the most part. The difference between Latinos and blacks in Chicago is segregation. Both groups as a result of the economic instability saw their poverty rates increase from twenty to thirty percent during the Seventies and then slowly rise thereafter.

Mexican Americans typically live in neighborhoods that are half non-Hispanic white according to census data. Blacks live in neighborhoods that are ninety percent black on average. Say for the sake of argument, it's 100 percent. Now what happens? Both groups have a rise in poverty from twenty to thirty percent, the same thing happens to both groups. But what happens to the place where blacks and Mexicans live? Black neighborhoods, because of segregation absorb all the economic shock. Every neighborhood where every black person lives goes from twenty to thirty percent poor.

A rise in poverty is another way of saying income is extracted. Extracting income closes businesses, puts off needed housing repairs, forestalls investment, and this is on top of the institutionalized discrimination that cuts off mortgage monies. It is a shock that is big enough to set neighborhoods on a downward spiral of decline because even if you want to maintain your property, put money in your home and invest in it, if the neighborhood is deteriorating around you because of forces that are beyond your control, that are structurally built into the circumstance of urban life by segregation, then you have no incentive to do so because you will never be able to recoup that investment in the form of higher rents and never be able to recoup that investment in the form of home equity when you sell the house because the neighborhood's going down around you. And this is all built into the system, an individual can do nothing about it.

Now what happens to Mexican Americans? Well, they live in neighborhoods that are half non-Hispanic white and their poverty rates for non-Hispanic whites were flat over the decade. So neighborhoods where Mexicans live on average increase a little bit in their poverty rate, things get a little worse, but the neighborhood does not experience a huge shock because Mexicans are scattered around the metropolitan area and are widely dispersed throughout Chicago's neighborhoods. A variety of neighborhoods absorb the shock and every neighborhood gets a little bit poorer, but no neighborhood gets a lot poorer. The neighborhood circumstances under which Mexicans live does not compare at all to neighborhood circumstances under which blacks live. No group except for blacks can be found in any way in neighborhoods that are fifty or sixty percent poor. That only happens in this society to poor black people and the reason is segregation.

As you concentrate poverty, you concentrate anything that is correlated with poverty so you end up concentrating welfare dependency, you end up concentrating single parenthood, you end up concentrating crime, you end up concentrating a series of social problems, and you create a social environment for people to adapt to where these things are not only common but in many cases are normative. More than fifty percent of the people are in these circumstances, and is is literally the case in these neighborhoods that some people may not know anyone who has a job, almost everyone is a single parent, and a large majority is on welfare at some point or another. This is a social environment created by a vicious interaction between high and rising rates of poverty and high levels of segregation, and it is a social environment that is structurally created for only one group in American society and that is Americans with some ancestry from Africa.

So the argument that I make is that segregation is not just something that you can compartmentalize and say, oh, sure, we're segregated, now let's talk about our other problems and how to fix them. Unless you deal with the issue of segregation, unless you face the reality that black well being is systematically and forcefully undermined by the persisting segregation of African Americans in U.S. cities, you can never solve all these other problems.

Because race and class interact uniquely for black Americans to undermine their well being in this society you can only get so far by trying to fix education in a race neutral manner, trying to fix welfare problems in a race neutral manner, trying to fix employment problems through some kind of race neutral manner because the other side of the equation, the other half of the interaction is something that very much has to do with race. It is race and not class that promotes segregation. If you look at segregation patterns by income, blacks in the most affluent income categories are as segregated as blacks in the lowest income categories. You need race specific policies to dismantle the high rise, federally subsidized ghettos that were structured in the 1950s and the 1960s as part of a deliberate attempt to isolate and control black people. You need both attention to class issues racial issues in the arena of housing if you hope to succeed because if you do not, then whatever investments you make in individual welfare and education, individual welfare in terms of dependency on welfare institutions, whatever benefits you may achieve for individual efforts in job training will tend to be overwhelmed by the disastrous neighborhood conditions that arise directly as a consequence of segregation.

So until we face the reality that we are a segregated society, that segregation is involuntary and that segregation works forcefully and systematically to undermine the well being of black Americans, then you are just kidding yourself.

WILLIAM J. WILSON

In their recent book, Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton argue that "concentrated poverty is created by a pernicious interaction between a group's overall rate of poverty and its degree of segregation in society. When a highly segregated group experiences a high or rising rate of poverty, geographically concentrated poverty is the inevitable result." Now however convincing the logic of that argument, it does not explain the following. The poverty rate of metropolitan blacks hardly changed at all between 1980 and 1990. The poverty rate of ghettos, that is, census tracts with poverty rates of at least forty percent, increased while the poverty rates of non-ghettos decreased. These are black non-ghettos. Also, in the ten community areas that make up the historic core of the Chicago black belt, the poverty rate increased, in fact, almost doubled, from 32.5 percent in 1970 to 50.4 percent in 1990 despite the fact that the black poverty rate for the city of Chicago increased from only 25.1 percent to 32.6 percent. These communities have been overwhelmingly black for the last three decades, yet they lost half their residents, 267,000, between 1970 and 1990. Finally, Chicago had a 61.5 percent increase in the number of ghetto census tracts. That is, tracts with poverty rates of at least forty percent from 1980 to 1990, even though the ghetto core increased from only 24 to 25 percent.

But Chicago is not unique in this respect. The number of ghetto census tracts increase in a substantial majority of the metropolitan areas in the country including those with declining levels of ghetto poverty. Nine new ghetto census tracts were added in Philadelphia even though it had one of the largest declines in ghetto poverty. In a number of other cities including Baltimore, Boston, and Washington, D.C., a smaller percentage of poor blacks lived in a larger number of ghetto census tracts.

Paul Jargowski of the University of Texas in Dallas reflects on the significance of this substantial spread of ghetto areas. He states, "The geographical size of a city's ghetto has a large effect on the perception of the magnitude of the problem associated with ghetto poverty." How big an area of the city do you consider off limits? How far out of your way will you drive not to go through a dangerous area? Indeed the lower density exacerbated the problem. More abandoned buildings mean more places for crack dens and criminal enterprises. Police trying to protect a given number of citizens have to be stretched over a wider number of square miles making it less likely that criminals will be caught. Lower density also makes it harder for a sense of community to develop or for people to feel that they can find safety in numbers. From the point of view of local political officials, the increase in the size of the ghetto is a disaster. Many of those leaving the ghettos settle in non-ghetto areas outside the political jurisdiction of the central city. Thus, geographic size of the ghetto is expanding cutting a wider swath through the hearts of metropolitan areas.

To focus mainly on segregation to account for the growth of concentrated poverty is to miss some of the dynamic aspects of social and demographic changes in cities like Chicago. There is no doubt that the disproportionate concentration of poverty among African Americans is one of the legacies of historic racial segregation. It is also true that segregation often enhances black vulnerability to other changes in society including as we shall soon see economic changes. Given the existence of segregation and I agree with Massey's assessment of the causes and degree of segregation, including the government's role in the creation and perpetuation of segregation, but given the existence of segregation, what are some of the other changes that have to be taken into account? Or given the existence of segregation, one has to account for the way in which other changes in society interact with segregation to produce the dramatic transformation of inner city ghetto neighborhoods especially since 1970. In *The Truly Disadvantaged*, I focus mainly on the period from 1970, not to suggest that poverty concentration was new, but to argue that following the recession, many of the gains in inner city neighborhoods in the two decades prior to 1970 were wiped out. To argue as does Massey that concentrated black poverty is not new does not explain why such poverty rose so dramatically during the 1970s, and continues its climb, albeit at a slightly lower rate during the 1980's. Nor does it address a far more fundamental problem that is at the heart of the dramatic increase in concentrated poverty, namely the rapid growth of joblessness that accelerated through the 1970s and 1980s.

The problems in ghetto neighborhoods are not due to poverty alone. Something far more devastating has happened that can only be comprehended by considering the rapid growth of concentrated joblessness and its long term crippling affects on neighborhoods, families and individuals.

The growth of joblessness in the inner city ghetto represents a new urban poverty that has far ranging ramifications for the larger urban area. By the new urban poverty I mean poor segregated neighborhoods in which a substantial majority of individual adults are either unemployed or have dropped out of the labor force. For example, only one in three adults, 35 percent, ages 16 and over, in the twelve Chicago community areas with poverty rates that exceeded forty percent were employed in 1990. Each of these community areas located on the south and west sides of the city is overwhelmingly black. We can add to these twelve high jobless areas three additional predominantly black community areas with rates of poverty of 29, 30 and 36 percent, respectively, where only four in ten, 42 percent of the adults, worked in 1990. Thus, in these fifteen black community areas representing a total population of over 425,000, only 37 percent of all the adults were gainfully employed in 1990. By contrast, 54 percent of the adults in the seventeen other predominantly black community areas in Chicago with a total population of over 545,000 were employed in 1990 which is close to the citywide figure of 57 percent.

Finally, except for one largely Asian community with an employment rate of 46 percent and one large Latino community with an employment rate of 49 percent, a majority of the adults were employed in each of the 45 other community areas of Chicago. To repeat, the new urban poverty represents poor segregated neighborhoods in which a substantial majority of the adults are not working.

To illustrate the magnitude of the changes that have occurred, let me focus on the three Chicago community areas that were featured in Sinclair Drake and Horace Cayton's classic study, *Black Metropolis*, which was published in 1945. These three neighborhoods are Douglas, Grand Boulevard and Washington Park. These three community areas were labeled "Bronzeville" in the book. A majority of the adults sixteen and over were gainfully employed in these three areas in 1950, five years after the publication of *Black Metropolis*. By 1990, only four in ten in Douglas worked, one in three in Washington Park, and one in four at Grand Boulevard.

When the first edition of *Black Metropolis* was published in 1945, there was much greater class integration in the black community. As Drake and Cayton pointed out, Bronzeville residents had limited success and I quote, "in sorting themselves out in broad community areas which might be designated as lower class and middle class. Instead of middle class areas, Bronzeville tends to have middle class buildings in all areas or a few middle class blocks here and there." The point is that though they may have lived on different streets, blacks of all classes in inner city areas such as Bronzeville lived in the same community, shopped at the same stores, their children went to the same schools, they played in the same parks, and although there was some degree of class antagonism, their neighborhoods were more stable than inner city neighborhoods of today. In short, they featured higher levels of social organization. By social organization I mean the extent to which the residents of a neighborhood are able to maintain effective social control and realize their common values.

There are two major dimensions of neighborhood social organization. One, the prevalent strength and interdependence of social networks, and two, the extent of collective supervision that the residents direct and the personal responsibility they assume in addressing neighborhood problems. Social organization is reflected in both formal institutions and informal networks. Neighborhoods in which the adults are connected by an extensive set of obligations, expectations and social networks are in a better position to control and supervise the activities and behavior of children and monitor developments in a neighborhood, for example, the breaking up of congregations of youth on street corners and the supervision of youth leisure time activities. Neighborhoods plagued with high levels of joblessness are more likely to experience problems of social organization. The two go hand in hand. High rates of joblessness trigger other problems in a neighborhood that adversely affect social organization ranging from crime, gang violence and drug trafficking to family breakups and problems in the organization of family life.

Consider for example the problems of drug trafficking and violent crime. As many studies have revealed, the decline of legitimate employment opportunities among inner city residents builds up incentives to sell drugs. The distribution of crack in a neighborhood attracts individuals who have been involved in violence and other crimes. Violent persons in the crack marketplace help shape its social organization and its impact on the neighborhood. Neighborhoods plagued by high levels of joblessness, insufficient economic opportunities and high residential mobility are unable to control the volatile drug market and the violent crimes associated with it. As informal controls weaken in areas where drugs are distributed, the social processes that regulate behavior change.

The problems of joblessness and neighborhood social organization, including crime and drug trafficking, are reflected in the responses to a 1993 survey we conducted on a random sample of adult residents in two of the new poverty neighborhoods on the south side of Chicago, Woodlawn and Oakland. In 1990, 37 percent of the 27,000 adults were employed in Woodlawn, and only 23 percent of the 5,000 adults worked in Oakland. When asked how much of a problem unemployment is in their neighborhood, 73 percent of the residents in Woodlawn and 76 percent of those in Oakland said that is a major problem. The responses to the survey also revealed the residents' concerns about a series of related problems such as crime and drug and alcohol abuse, problems that are symptomatic of communities experiencing severe problems of social organization. Indeed crime was identified as a major problem by 66 percent of the residents in each neighborhood. Drug abuse was a major problem by as many as 86 percent of the adult residents in Oakland and 79 percent of those in Woodlawn. Alcohol abuse was considered a major problem by an overwhelming majority of the residents, 72 percent of Woodlawn and 80 percent in Oakland.

Now the point I want to make is this: although high jobless neighborhoods also feature concentrated poverty, high rates of neighborhood poverty are less likely to trigger problems of social organization if the residents are working. To repeat, in previous years the working poor stood out in communities like Bronzeville, Woodlawn and Oakland. Today, the non-working poor are heavily represented in such neighborhoods.

Since 1970, two factors largely account for both the rise in a proportion of adults who are jobless, and the sharp decline in the social organization in inner city ghetto communities. There are other factors that I don't have time to go into, but are outlined in my book that includes some of the points that Doug Massey talked about and that is a contribution of government, creation of these housing projects in segregated neighborhoods, disinvestment and so on. But two factors that I want to focus on here are the following. The first is the impact of changes in the economy. Now although these processes have had an adverse effect on all poor minorities, they have been especially devastating for the lower class black male. In 1950, 69 percent of all males fourteen and over in the Bronzeville neighborhoods of Douglas, Grand Boulevard and Washington Park worked, 69 percent. By 1990, only 37 percent of all males sixteen and over worked in these three neighborhoods. Thirty and forty years ago, the overwhelming majority of black males were working. Most of them were poor, but they held regular jobs around which their daily family life was organized. When black men looked for work, employers were concerned about whether they had strong backs because they would be working in a factory or in a back room of his shop doing heavy lifting and labor. They faced discrimination, they faced the job ceiling, but they were working. The work was hard and they were hired. Now the economic restructuring has broken the figurative back of the black working population. Data from our urban poverty and family life study show that 72 percent of Chicago's employed inner city black fathers, ages fifteen and over and without bachelor's degrees, who were born between 1950 and 1955 worked in manufacturing and construction industries in 1970, 72 percent. By 1980, that figure fell to 27 percent. Of those born between 1956 and 1960, 52 percent worked in manufacturing and construction industries as late as 1978. By 1987, that figure had declined to 28 percent. These employment changes have recently accompanied the loss of traditional manufacturing and other blue collar jobs in Chicago. As a result, young black males have turned increasingly to low wage service sector and laboring jobs for employment or have gone jobless.

The attitudes of inner city black men who express bitterness and resentment about their employment prospects and low wage work settings combine with their erratic work histories and high turnover jobs to create the widely shared perception that black men are undesirable workers. This perception becomes a basis for employer discrimination that sharply increases in a weak economy. Over the long term, discrimination has also grown because employers have been turning increasingly to an expanding immigrant and female labor force. Many young men in inner city neighborhoods today have responded to these declining opportunities by resorting to crime, drugs and violence.

The association between joblessness and social dislocation should come as no surprise. Recent longitudinal research by Delbert Elliot based on national youth survey data from 1976 to 1989, covering ages eleven to thirty, demonstrated a strong relationship between joblessness and serious violent crime among young black males. As Elliot points out, the transition from adolescence to adulthood is usually associated with a sharp drop in most crimes including serious violent behavior as individuals take on new adult roles and responsibilities. This is one of the points that I was driving home when I had dinner with President Clinton at the White House a few weeks ago before his Memphis speech. I said you've got to associate a lot of the problems with declining employment opportunities, and I was pleased that he incorporated some of these points in his speech.

Participation and serious violent offending increases from ages eleven to twelve to ages fifteen and sixteen, then declines dramatically with advancing age. Although black and white males reveal similar age curves, the negative slope of the age curve for blacks after age twenty is substantially less than that of whites. Elliot found that the black-white differential in a percentage of males involved in serious violent crimes was close to even at age eleven, increased to three to two over the remaining years of adolescence, and reached a differential of nearly four to one during the late twenties. However, when Elliot only compared employed blacks and whites, he found no significant difference between the two groups in rates of suspension or termination of violent behavior by age 21. Employed black males experience a precipitous decline in serious violent behavior after their adolescent period. Accordingly, a major reason for this substantial overall racial gap in the termination of violent behavior following the adolescent period is a large proportion of jobless black males whose serious violent behavior was more likely to extend into adulthood. The high rate of violence among jobless black males has in turn fed the image of young black men as dangerous.

So when they look for work in competition with immigrants, women or whites, employers prefer not to hire "trouble." As one employer in our urban poverty and family life study put it, "All of a sudden, they take a look at a guy. Unless he's got an in, the reason I hired this black kid the last time is because my neighbor said to me, yeah, I used him for a few days, he's good. And I said, you know what, I'm going to take a chance but it was a recommendation but other than that, I've got a walk in and who knows. And I think that for the most part, a guy sees a black man, he's a bit hesitant because I don't know." I should also point out that the employment prospects of black women have also declined because they've had to compete for service jobs with a growing number of white women and immigrants who have entered the labor market. Historically, white women have had lower rates of employment than black women. However, since the early 1980s, largely because of the increased unemployment of black women, white women spend more years working. Again, the problem is more acute in the inner cities. Urban black mothers nationally had worked over half of the time since age eighteen, whereas mothers from Chicago's inner city had only worked 39 percent of the time.

The growing joblessness in the inner city has accompanied a decreasing percentage of non-poor residents, and this brings us to the second factor in the rise in the proportion of jobless individuals in families, and the increase in problems of social organization in ghetto neighborhoods changes in the class and racial composition of such neighborhoods. Concentrated poverty is positively associated with joblessness, this should come as no surprise. As stated previously, poor people today are far more likely to be unemployed or out of the labor force. In *The Truly Disadvantaged* I argued that inner city neighborhoods have experienced a growing concentration of poverty for several reasons. One, the out migration of non-poor black families, two, the exodus of white and other non-black families, and three, the rise in a number of residents who have become poor while living in these areas. Additional research and a growth of concentrated poverty has suggested another factor, the movement of poor people into a neighborhood.

I believe that the extent to which any one factor is significant in helping to account for the decrease in a proportion of non-poor individuals and families depends on the poverty level and racial or ethnic makeup of the neighborhood at a given point in time. For example, as I've pointed out in *The Truly Disadvantaged*, the community areas of Chicago that experienced the most substantial white out migration between 1970 and 1980 were those with rates of family poverty between twenty and twenty-nine percent in 1980. Today four of these communities are predominantly black, but only one, Greater Grand Crossing, can be classified as a new poverty area. Now this community area, Greater Grand Crossing, unlike the other three black community areas with poverty rates in the twenty percent range in 1980, remain virtually all black between 1970 and 1980, 99 percent in 1970, 99 percent in 1990. Since a clear majority, 61 percent of the adults in Greater Grand Crossing were employed in 1970, the transformation into a new poverty area cannot be associated, that is because there are 44 percent of the adults were employed in 1990, the transformation into a new poverty area cannot be associated with the exodus of white residents who usually record higher employment rates. Considering the strong association between poverty and joblessness, the sharp rise in the proportion of adults who are not working in Greater Grand Crossing could have been related either to the out migration of non-poor families, and perhaps even more significant the increase in the number of poor families. Between 1970 and 1990 despite a 29 percent reduction in the population, the absolute number of poor individuals in Greater Grand Crossing increased by 64 percent. This could have been brought about either by the downward mobility of some non-poor residents who became poor, or by the in migration of poor individuals and families during this period. It should be pointed out, however, that between 1950 and 1960, Greater Grand Crossing drastically changed from six percent black to 86 percent black in just ten years.

To the extent that whites were no longer represented in the neighborhood in substantial numbers by 1960, the chances of a neighborhood becoming a new poverty area increased because African Americans in general are at a greater risk of experiencing joblessness. In other words, Greater Grand Crossing's change to a new poverty area from 1970 to 1990 cannot be directly related to a white exodus. The emptying out of the white population out of a neighborhood from 1950 to 1960 increased the area's vulnerability to changes in the economy after 1970. Of the fourteen other new poverty areas including three Bronzeville neighborhoods of Douglas, Grand Boulevard and Washington Park, five have remained overwhelmingly black since 1950. Therefore, their transformation into new poverty areas is mainly associated with economic and demographic changes among the African American residents.

The declining proportion of families, especially non-poor families, and the increasing and prolonged joblessness in the new poverty neighborhoods make it considerably more difficult to sustain basic neighborhood institutions. In the face of increasing joblessness, stores, banks, credit institutions, restaurants and professional services lose regular and potential patrons. Churches experience dwindling numbers of parishioners and shrinking resources. Recreational facilities, block clubs, community groups and other informal organizations also suffer. As these organizations decline, the means of formal and informal social control in the neighborhood become weaker. Levels of crime and street violence increase as a result leading to further deterioration of the neighborhood. As the neighborhood deteriorates, those who are able to leave do so, including many working and middle class families. Indeed the problem is exacerbated by the lower population density in many of these neighborhoods. As I mentioned previously, the greater the number of abandoned buildings, the increasing likelihood that crack dens and criminal enterprises will establish a foothold in the community. Precipitous declines in density also make it more difficult to sustain or develop a sense of community or for people to experience a feeling of safety in numbers.

Perhaps the changes that have occurred in many inner city neighborhoods are best captured in this statement by a senior citizen from the community of Oakland on the south side, a neighborhood that has been overwhelmingly black since 1950. She states, this is an elder citizen, "I'vebeen here since March 21, 1953. When I moved in, the neighborhood was intact. It was intact with homes, beautiful homes, mansions, many mansions, with stores, laundromats, with cleaners, with Chinese cleaners. We had drugstores, we had hotels, we had doctors over on 39th Street, we had doctor offices in the neighborhood. We had the middle class, we had the upper class. It has gone from affluent to where it is today, and I would like to see it come back, that we can have some of the things we had. Since I came in young and I'm a senior citizen now, I would like to see some of the things come back so that I could enjoy them like we did when we first came in." The neighborhood with a significant proportion of black working families stand in sharp contrast to these new poverty areas. Research that we have conducted on the social organization of Chicago neighborhoods reveals that in addition to much lower levels of perceived unemployment than in the poor neighborhoods, black working and middle class neighborhoods also have much higher levels of perceived social control and cohesion, organizational services and social support despite being racially segregated.

A rise of new poverty neighborhoods represents a movement from what the historian, Alan Spear, has called an institutional ghetto in which the structure and activities of the larger society are duplicated as portrayed in Drake and Cayton's description of Bronzeville, to an unstable ghetto which lacks the capability to provide opportunities, resources and adequate social controls. In my book, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, I highlighted the importance of joblessness in urban neighborhoods, however, much of the discussion in the book was devoted to concentrated poverty. In my forthcoming book, the focus is much more on concentrated joblessness and its effects on the organization of neighborhoods, families and individuals. The new challenge to the research community is to examine the factors that have contributed to the unprecedented rise of joblessness including persistent joblessness in the inner city neighborhoods, and the effect of this joblessness not only on these neighborhoods but the larger urban community as well. The challenge to policymakers is to find ways to improve the employment base in these high jobless neighborhoods, and to prevent the spread of joblessness to other urban neighborhoods that have become increasingly vulnerable to economic changes in the larger society. Regardless of their level of poverty, neighborhoods represented by working adults are entirely different from neighborhoods that feature non-working adults.

Let me end by returning to the problem of racial segregation. Without racial segregation, we would not be talking about the new urban poverty. However, as I pointed out previously, given the existence of segregation, one then has to account for the way in which other changes in society interact with segregation to produce the dramatic social transformation of the inner city neighborhoods especially since 1970. In my remarks today, I've outlined some of these changes. As long as segregation exists, the black community is vulnerable to these changes. Efforts to reduce racial segregation would surely improve any policy to enhance black employment. However, a federal policy of rapid desegregation in housing is a political and practical impossibility. As long as there are alternative areas where whites can retreat, the overall degree of segregation will very likely be maintained. Blacks move in, whites move out, and this process can be fairly rapid as we have seen in communities like Greater Grand Crossing and Austin. They changed overnight. The only way to stem this pattern would be to restrict the freedom of movement of whites or make it relatively costly to move. However, government restrictions on the freedom of movement in a democratic society would be both unrealistic and undesirable. But the curtailment of exclusionary zoning practices and more aggressive enforcement of the Fair Housing Act could start a process of a gradual decline in racial segregation. The gains over a period of decades could be fairly substantial. In the meantime, we should focus a good deal of our attention on the fastest and most efficient way to combat the new urban poverty. The creation of programs to increase employment, especially black employment, would help to stabilize the new poverty neighborhoods and halt the precipitous decline in density.

JOHN CALLAWAY: Well, I must say that when I was invited to moderate this, I told our colleagues at the Urban League that it was with great anticipation that I was going to listen to these two giants of social research. And because at a certain level, it's like we've really got a huge conflict here between these two giants in the same department working together, at the same university and this is really high drama. Can I quit moderating and run to the telephone and call the Associated Press with the winner. I mean this is historic and yet as I listen to this and maybe I'm wrong, as I listen to this, I'm hearing a kind of double whammy story here that isn't necessarily in conflict that much with each other. In other words, I'm hearing one scholar say, dear friends, with all due respect to the work that Dr. King did and everybody in this room has done and so on and so forth, we still have a huge problem of racial prejudice. I mean this is kind of like textbook clear that there's still racial prejudice. It's just huge even though there are a million ways that you can look at it if you want to be anecdotal and say, oh, we're making progress.

I had a conversation with Doug earlier. I talked about coming into Chicago in the middle of 1950's and it was just an entirely different feeling of a city in terms of segregation. Now you can see all kinds of people downtown of all races and creeds working as one and so forth. But what I'm hearing from Doug is with all acknowledgement of that, with all the thousands of individual stories you can tell that are nice, you still have an overwhelming racial prejudice problem. I don't hear Bill Wilson fighting that as much as I hear Bill say, and on top of that, you have this huge structural economic change that has occurred in this world and in this city. And guess what, who gets hit hardest by that? So to me the sobering truth of what we've just heard is that you have this combination of the two realities. They're not I think in great conflict with each other; I don't even think you have much in conflict with each other in terms of policy recommendations. That is to say, Doug, you do want some racial specific things with respect to the agenda that you're talking about, but I assume that you would have no great problem with any attention given to structural employment opportunities which I think we all acknowledge in this room are not necessarily race specific. I mean all kinds of people are facing dislocations, so I mean am I interpreting this correctly? Are you two guys closer than those of us in the press might make you out to be?

DOUGLAS MASSEY: I have no problem at all with anything that you've just said. In fact, I advocate attention to joblessness as well as segregation. My only point is that attention to joblessness alone without recognizing the unique effects of segregation and making that rising joblessness so severe for black people, misunderstands the problem and you simultaneously need to devote stringent efforts to opening up the housing market.

JOHN CALLAWAY: And Bill, is it fair, I mean am I being too rosy about this or do I see that you two are really much closer than say you are further apart in terms of these things?

WILLIAM WILSON: I've always maintained that our work is complimentary. When I talk about the need to stress race neutral policies, that doesn't mean that the comprehensive program should not include race specific policies. What I'm looking at is a useful strategy to get a comprehensive progressive program going, and what you highlight are the race neutral strategies to get everybody on board.

JOHN CALLAWAY: You're talking about politics.

WILLIAM WILSON: Right, but you include in that package the race specific strategies in order to accomplish what has to be accomplished, and you cannot deal with some of the problems in the inner city by not including certain race specific strategies including strategies to fight segregation and discrimination. I've always said that.

JOHN CALLAWAY: Doug are we in terms of what to do about the continuing racial prejudice, are we to simply say in other words, to government agencies and you might say to investigative reporters, keep blowing the whistle on housing discrimination. Don't think this was a 1940s thing. I assume that anything that we could do there should be done, but I mean does it have to go back also to the fact that we need a major educational effort on the whole, I mean I'm thinking of classroom work and television work on racial prejudice.

DOUGLAS MASSEY: I agree completely that we need to devote a lot more time and resources to educational efforts not only to reduce prejudice because rising education according to all the data that we've accumulated for thirty years leads to lower levels of prejudice, but also because low levels of education reinforce prejudice because they perpetuate the social problems and negatively stereotype blacks. And it's not only in our narrow self interest to invest in education in this fashion, it's almost in our general self interest to enhance our competitiveness in increasingly globalized markets. We're under-investing in education, particularly under-investing in education in inner cities and particularly under-investing in education in inner city minority communities. And unless that problem is rectified, we're going to face very serious difficulties as a nation.

JOHN CALLAWAY: Bill Wilson, just a follow-up question for you. When you talk about the lack of density, in other words, your data indicates ghetto areas expanding, density not as great in some neighborhoods, and I wasn't here earlier for his comments so that when Mayor Daley is quoted as saying that, hey, if the city gets to be smaller, that's okay, we can deal with that. What I'm hearing you say is, Mr. Mayor, think twice about that because there is a way that a city gets smaller that makes it much more difficult to manage.

WILLIAM WILSON: I'm not suggesting that density is necessarily a good thing. What I'm saying is that the sharp decline in density has created problems of neighborhood social organization because the city has not bulldozed down a lot of those abandoned buildings where all these crack dens and criminal activities are taking place, and the residents are very fearful. In our survey I was struck by how many people mention a major concern about abandoned buildings. So I think that if you could bulldoze down those buildings and put people back to work despite the lower density, the neighborhoods will be far more stable.

JOHN CALLAWAY: And Bill, I had one other follow up question. On the ten community core black areas that you mentioned that lost 267,000 residents between 1970 and 1990, do you have any data on where those persons went?

WILLIAM WILSON: No, just a theory. What has happened is that a lot of neighborhoods have become new poverty areas, and have moved into what we call ghetto areas because the poor have left some of these inner city areas like the black belt and have moved into other neighborhoods that have since become new poverty areas or ghetto areas. And so you get an area like Austin for example which probably receive a lot of people who left Woodlawn and Oakland and places like that, and the number of poor people in Austin is rising quite rapidly. And I think probably some of that is due to the in migration of the poor from some of these poorer neighborhoods.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Professor Wilson, I would like to know what is this speech you made, what effect is it supposed to have? Is it supposed to help the situation? And also Mr. Massey, I wonder where Mr. Massey came from. He's talking about segregation as much as you might have talked about it thirty or forty years ago, isn't he? And Mr. Wilson too. I want to know are these speeches going to appear in the *Tribune* next week and I'm going to have to call them and tell them they wrong. I see where I live north, south, east and west, I see taxpayers, Negro taxpayers, people that seem to be doing pretty good and not worrying about segregation. Why are you doing this?

WILLIAM WILSON: Well, I think that we are trying to create an awareness of some very, very serious problems. If you don't recognize the seriousness of a problem or if you don't even recognize the problem, you're hardly in a position to do something about it. And I'm not so much concerned about whether this is covered in the *Tribune*, what I am concerned about is whether or not the work that I've been doing with the Clinton administration where I've outlined these problems as having some impact. The Clinton administration has introduced several programs that are designed to address some of the problems that I've talked about, the earned income tax credit, the creation of national health insurance, a comprehensive health insurance so that people who are working will be covered by health insurance.

DOUGLAS MASSEY: These approaches are steps in the right direction. I believe that the best way to combat problems of joblessness in these inner city neighborhoods is to create tight labor markets, and to come up with a federal program of employment that would be designed to stimulate employment in the private sector and to create government sector jobs as a last resort. These things are also being talked about. First of all, where I'm coming from, I do not advocate integration, what I advocate is a quality of opportunity and openness of housing markets. If you're going to distribute housing through a market, then everybody has to have access to that market. And the evidence suggests that one group of people is systematically being disenfranchised from that market. And nor do I advocate that black people should want to live with white people. I think that black people should do what they want to do. And they should have the freedom to do that. And if they want to live in predominantly black neighborhoods, fine. But even I recognize that in many cases, even if you would other -- other things equal would like to live in predominantly black neighborhoods, sometimes your job doesn't take you there. Sometimes the opportunities aren't there. Sometimes you want access to other things and you need to make a trade off. What I'm advocating is the freedom to make that trade off.

As to what effect my ideas might have, the book has generally been well received and particularly in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which, for the first time in thirty years has a secretary that I think understands the importance of housing segregation and understands the need to open housing markets. And is having a very direct effect on people's lives, because we have a secretary in Henry B. Cisneros, who is willing to go to Vidador, Texas to force local housing authorities to stop acting in a discriminatory fashion. To give people their rights of access to a public good that they'd formerly been denied. And he's willing to enforce the U.S. Fair Housing Act, by putting pressure on real estate industries, by calling the banking industry to task. He's putting money behind these enforcement efforts. Real resources that will open up opportunities for people. Now the only issue is, how many resources? What effect can he have? And what kind of political support will he get from the whiter Clinton Administration. But so far, the signs are very promising that he is moving forcefully for the first time in 30 years in this area.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I don't think that we should underestimate the importance of these scholars as people who have effects on public policy and that's the thing to really be concerned about. Not necessarily frightened but concerned. My 75 years of growing up in Chicago gives me mixed feelings about both positions. The point is that we keep talking about the forces of the outside, and what the forces of outside impose upon the inside, that is, the ghettos. What is it that that community which is being acted on, does not necessarily have to be, or is it passive? What instructions would Prof. Massey and Wilson give to that community, of which I am a part, in order so that we could raise our, not only our sights, but our successes, so that our children will be able to see and be the beneficiaries of those examples? I would like to get some comment from both of our panelists on this issue.

JOHN CALLAWAY: Okay what do you do Bill, from within the community, even if you get the White House going pretty nicely.

WILLIAM WILSON: Well, one thing is quite clear, if you're talking about some of the more impoverished communities. Communities that are focused on today. As people are fearful, they're concerned about safety. And they feel isolated and one thing that I would like to see is the organizations working to have people in contact with one another. Where the meet often and they talk about the neighborhood problems, and the organize themselves to address some of the negative influences that have come into the community, for example, the crack dens and abandoned houses. Get petitions going and march down on City Hall and demand that buildings be torn down. Have safety patrols going on the streets so get the residents to organize safety patrols, so that the kids can feel safe walking to and from school. That's another major concern that they have. In other words, I think that the residents themselves can work to enhance the social organization of the neighborhood, even though neighborhoods are facing overwhelming problems. And people really want that and I think that people, I know that there are a number of community organizers here who are doing a very good job in that respect and I'd like to see those efforts increase.

DOUGLAS MASSEY: I would agree, that people need to organize politically to get their rights. To get the city to tear down abandoned buildings which, themselves contribute to a lot of the social disorganization and crime and other problems. And they need to organize politically to get a greater share of resources invested in that community, because every year or so, the *Tribune* does an analysis of where tax revenues are spent, and black neighborhoods are traditionally underspent to what the contribute in the way of taxes and that's a political decision, that requires political action. Political process that you go through to get access to investments. You also need to organize politically to put pressure on private institutions to make sure that the investments are coming to the neighborhood, as I have said, evidence shows that black neighborhoods don't get the share of money that they would normally -- could normally expect under an open market. Now you need to go to banking institutions. Why don't you have any branches in this community? Why aren't you making loans in this community? And publicize this, because I think they're extraordinarily sensitive to pressure of this sort and evidence suggests that you can bring real change in this fashion. So there are things you can do at the local level to deal with a lot of the consequences of the high level of segregation and the disinvestment that's gone hand in hand with that segregation.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Yes, my name is Jim Shannon and I work for the Leadership Council. And my question is directed to Dr. Wilson. In the last 20 years, we've seen this proliferation of jobs to the northwest suburbs and also to DuPage County. We have the high tech corridor along the East-West Tollway. And to see all this job growth in areas where African-Americans are less than two percent of the population, and we see as segregation increase in the inner city, the jobs there have been decreasing. In your argument, I could not understand or maybe I didn't get it clearly, and maybe you can clear it up for me, I cannot understand how you could not make the connection between joblessness in the inner city and segregation? And I just could not get the way that you didn't make that connection.

WILLIAM WILSON: You've seen my book, that there is almost a chapter devoted to that and I used the comments from the inner city residents to reinforce that concern. We talked to the black residents of Chicago, and they will tell you that their job prospects are much greater if they could get access to employment in the suburbs. And so what I have done is, I have -- in fact I've even recommended in memos to the Clinton Administration, that because inner city residents are segregated from the job opportunities, what we need to do is create programs like subsidized car pools, to get people to where the jobs are. So I'm quite fully aware of that problem.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Yes, my name is Carolyn Hodgewest. I'm the Assistant State Comptroller. I'd like to direct my question to Mr. Massey. In your book you talk about the need to integrate the housing market and as we all would probably agree, that access to housing is the quickest source to equity and the creation of wealth. But I want to talk to you about what I suspect others would argue, particularly politicians who represent black districts. They would argue that the integration would dilute their ability to seek elective office and/or be elected to office. And in talking to this crowd here, I think it's great that, and I think your book is brilliant, but I'd like to ask, how do you frame the discussion of integration? In other words, so what's in it, if I were white sitting here, what's in it for white homeowners to integrate their communities? And I'm raising that issue to say, I think if you framed the discussion from the win/win perspective for everybody involved, and I'd like to hear your -- both you and Dr. Wilson's comments on that issue.

DOUGLAS MASSEY: Well, the political effects of segregation are very much a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it creates a lot of safe districts for black representatives. On the other hand, it doesn't make for very competitive races and if you look at those districts that electoral participation over time goes down, and it dilutes overall black political power in citywide or statewide or countywide offices. Second, although it makes it easy to elect black representatives, segregation marginalizes them politically, and makes it easier to -- makes it more difficult for them to protect the interests of their constituents. Because segregation creates an isolation of political interests. So if you want to close, let's say, close an "el" stop that serves the Mexican neighborhood, what's going to happen? Well, Mexicans will be bent out of shape and not only -- but not only Mexicans will be bent out of shape, because probably they're a bunch of old Polish ladies and Ukrainian and Lithuanians and some other people in the neighborhood as well, and they'll be connected to people in other neighborhoods and they'll talk to their cousin who lives in Rostenkowski's district or Ed Burke's district, and pretty soon you've got a broad-based coalition to forestall the closure of the "el". Or closure of the facility. What happens when a political process requires closing some facilities and you close something in the black neighborhood? Well who loses? Black people. Who do they turn to on the basis of a commonality of interests, to forestall that disinvestment? They can't turn to anybody because they're isolated.

Integration creates a commonality of political interests, which is the glue of the political machine. And which is why that the black community when it was incorporated into the political machine, was incorporated as a machine within a machine. It was never part of the machine. It was something that was isolated and independent. Now, as black political -- as the ghettos become increasingly co-terminus with political boundaries in many areas, such as Detroit, then you end up with a situation where larger and larger shares of the overall electorate have less and less to gain from investments in the segregated black communities. And, in terms of their voting, they are -- the black representatives become increasingly marginalized, less able to form broader coalitions to protect the interests of their coalition. And I do not think that you need segregation to create political opportunities for blacks in the 1990's. I think the experience of Los Angeles, the experience of Seattle, the experience of a variety of metropolitan areas where blacks are not a majority are not, in fact, in Seattle they are desegregating rapidly. That you have black mayor and black mayor is very able to protect the interest, because people see this as a basis for common political interests. So, I think that segregation leads to representation in the short run, but in the long run, it undermines black political interests and the welfare of the population as a whole. Now, this creates a problem because, and I think one of the reasons that segregation as an issue is swept under the rug for so long, is because black politicians have very divided interests on this. Because any politician likes a safe district. And that's not me that noticed this, E. Franklin Frazer was the first one to notice this inherent conflict.

What do whites have to gain from housing integration? Well, I don't think that you necessarily need to think about gains. In the long run, we'll all gain as a country and but

I think the issue has to be framed as "dammit, it's the right thing to do!" That we're honoring the Constitution of the United States. We have a market. We distribute housing through markets. People deserve to have access to that market. I don't care whose interests it's in. That's the right thing to do. "It's the law of the land!" And you're going to obey it.

WILLIAM WILSON: I just wanted to add that there are a number, as I said in my remarks, a majority of black neighborhoods in the City of Chicago are stable. They're segregated but they're stable. They feature social organization. But on the other hand, they are vulnerable, because they are segregated. There is more pressure on such neighborhoods and more of a struggle to maintain neighborhood social organization. If they experience a significant out-migration, they're really vulnerable. And so, I think that anyone who would argue that neighborhood, segregated black neighborhoods are -- represent an ideal situation are just not considering the many facts that have been laid out here. That suggest that these neighborhoods are threatened regardless of how organized they are right now.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I'm Linda Carlton from Chicago, Women's Board of the Chicago Urban League. I'd like to know how the employment programs can interact with the social programs and social structures that Dr. Wilson said are effected by unemployment?

WILLIAM WILSON: How employment programs can interact with social programs? Well obviously, I think that any effort to revitalize a neighborhood should include economic revitalization, a social revitalization as well. When you have employment, when people are working, their behavior is very predictable, because they're organized. They organize their family life around work and their recreational life around work. They get up at the same time, they eat at the same time, and neighborhoods that are organized around work are much easier to organize socially, you see? Neighborhoods that are not organized around work, where behavior is much more random, much less predictable, are more difficult to organize socially, you see? So the two go hand in hand. So when you talk about neighborhood revitalization, you certainly have to include employment as the most important feature and then you organize around that.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: My name is Richard Tolliver. I'm a minister working in Bronzeville, also President of a redevelopment corporation which is rehabbing housing in Bronzeville. My question is to Dr. Massey. He indicated that a solution in the inner city is to tear down abandoned buildings. I wonder what research revealed that as a strategy? What we in housing rehab have discovered is, the money in terms of housing policy, is available for rehab, not for new construction. New construction costs much more. There are not support programs available for it, and I can give you a case in point. One of the buildings we rehabbed, the owner of a multi family unit next door, the insurance company threatened to cancel their homeowners insurance, because the building was abandoned, and they took us Housing Court, and also said if the building was torn down, the insurance would be canceled because you have a vacant lot next to the building. When we indicated that we were going to rehab the building, the insurance company restored the next door homeowner's homeownership insurance. Fine housing stock here. The only policy available now to bring back these mixed income areas, bringing working people in, is through rehabs. So how do you conclude that tearing them down is the answer?

WILLIAM WILSON: I think I should answer that because I mentioned it. I think the rehab is really a better way to go, by the way. I was just concerned about doing something about abandoned buildings. First thought that came to my mind was to bulldoze them down. But I agree with you, if you could rehab those buildings, it would be much better.

DOUGLAS MASSEY: I also agree. I think it's largely an economic decision about whether a building can be feasibly rehabbed or whether it's better to bulldoze and start from scratch. But other things equal, it's much better to rehab the housing and turn it into a viable part of the housing stock.

JOHN CALLAWAY: Ladies and gentlemen, I think you've experienced a very special hour and a half with our esteemed guests. Give them a big hand. Thank you very much.

PANEL 3

WHATLIES AHEAD

KENNETH SMITH

Our panel this afternoon will address what lies ahead. How do we reach greater equity and understanding amongst the growing diversity of our city and our nation. What are the limits to our diversity? Who must be involved? Who has driven social change historically? We have two speakers for this session. Both of whom need little introduction to you. Dr. Aldon Morris, Chair of the Department of Sociology at Northwestern and James J. O'Connor, Chair and CEO of Commonwealth Edison. And I might add, a former Chair of the Board of the Urban League. And I believe, Jim, my successor as Chair. So we're pleased to welcome them as well as all of you to this session.

ALDON MORRIS

First of all, good afternoon. I'm certainly pleased to be here. I couldn't help but think that the Urban League is always great for timing, given the weather. As I thought about addressing you today, my thoughts went back to W.B.DuBois because the question of racial inequality and what is to be the relationship between the races, is something that has been discussed and debated for centuries now. And of course, no one understood it better and analyzed it better, than did Dr. DuBois. So that in 1896, he wrote these words, and I'm going to read for a minute here. "We grant, (meaning the United States of America), we grant full citizenship in the world commonwealth to the Anglo-Saxon, to the Teuton, and the Latin, then with just a shade of reluctance, we extend it to the Celt and the Slav. We half deny it to the yellow races of Asia, admit the brown Indians to the anti-room only under stress of an undeniable past, but with the Negroes of Africa, we come to a full stop. And in its heart, the civilized world with one accord, denies that these (that is, African-Americans) come within the pale of 19th century humanity. This feeling, widespread, and deep-seated, is in America, the vastest of the Negro problems. We have to be sure a threatening problem of ignorance, but the ancestors of most Americans were far more ignorant than the Negro. These ex-slaves are poor, but not as poor as the Irish peasants used to be. Crime is rampant, but not more so if as much as in Italy. But the difference is that the ancestors of the English and the Irish and the Italians were felt to be worth educating, helping and guiding, because they were men and brothers, while in America, a census which gives a slight indication of the utter disappearance of the American Negro from the earth, is greeted with ill-concealed delight."

DuBois continues, "other centuries (and he was writing about a hundred years ago and so we're just about at the other century) other centuries looking back upon the culture of the Nineteenth, would have a right to suppose that if in a land of free men, eight millions of human beings were found to be dying of disease, the nation would cry with one voice. Heal them. If they were staggering on in ignorance, it would cry, train them. If they were harming themselves and others by crime, it would cry, guide them. And such cries are heard and have been heard in the land, but it was not one voice. And its volume has been ever broken by counter cries and echoes. Let them die! Train them like slaves! Let them stagger downward! This is a spirit that enters in and complicates all Negro social problems. And this is a problem which only civilization and humanity can successfully solve."

So these are the words of Dr. DuBois, as I said, written in 1898 in his famous study, *The Philadelphia Negro.* Though they were written almost a hundred years ago, they still ring with relevancy, and clarity today. Certainly, as we stand on the threshold of the 21st century.

I believe it to be true today that for most whites, there still exists a widespread and deep-seated feeling that African-Americans are somehow different and inferior to other races. The current cry, build more jails, is but another way to say, remove them, rather than guide them. The sorrowful state of public education in Chicago's inner city and throughout the nation, is another way to say, train them like slaves, rather than prepare them to cope with the challenges of the future.

Now then when we think about the excruciatingly high unemployment rates in the African-American community, especially among the youth, is this not a central reason for why these young people rob, injure and kill each other? The unemployment rate, this high unemployment rate seems to be another way to say, let them die.

In my presentation today, I want to emphasize three points. One, that racial inequality in America remains a fundamental problem and that this problem was created by whites and is currently maintained by whites.

Second, is that the burden of change rests with whites, but not only did they create this democratic state of affairs, but that as in the past, they currently control the levels of real power in this society. I don't think in an audience like this, I need to spend a great deal of time convincing you that blacks and whites are not equal in this society. Nor, that America still has a race problem. The Rodney King beating, the trial, and the rebellion that followed, made it all too clear that race matters in the United States. We would have to be extremely naive to be unfamiliar with the usual statistics, that black unemployment rate is two and one half to three times greater than the white rate. That one-third of black families live below the poverty line compared to eleven percent for white families. That black per capital annual earning is 56 percent of white earnings. That the median wealth of white households is more than eleven times that of black households. Forty-five percent of all black children under the age of 18, live in families below the poverty line, while only 16 percent of white children live in such families. And that the gloom and doom starts at the very beginning of life because the infant mortality rate for blacks is 18.5 percent, while for whites, it's only 9.3 percent. So that at the very beginning, black life is cheaper. Blacks are far more likely to die within the first year of birth. And then we also know that the life expectancy between blacks and whites drastically differs, so that even if you survive the first year, you're far more likely to die much earlier than whites.

So we all know that these inequalities have had a devastating impact on the African-American community. The black homicide rate, which we all think about and worry about is six to seven times greater than the white rate. That is, 8,000 blacks a year are killed. Almost half the prison inmates of the nation are black. And when I talk with people who work down at the Cook County Jail, they tell me that it's just about ninety percent black down in the Cook County Jail. The black representation in prison is about four times the representation in the general population. Currently, half of black families, as you know, are headed by a single female and such families are usually poor. And even more striking, I think, if we believe that somehow we're now headed toward equality and things are getting fine, is that currently few blacks are now entering college and graduate school than during the 1960s.

I think that what all these statistics don't show is the anger, the hurt, the disappointment, and the lack of hope characterized by so many African-Americans today. In July, I was in South Africa. And I visited a number of those townships and I looked into the eyes of those people and you could see just a vacant look. You could see a look of desperation. You just wondered, did they really feel that they were a part of the human family? But being in those townships in South Africa, was not anything entirely new to me. Because I've certainly been in communities right here in Chicago where I had the very same feelings that I had in those townships. This human suffering is usually hidden behind expressways, and railroad tracks, and other physical barriers. So that it does not offend the sensibilities of the fortunate.

Now the evidence or certainly the data just presented is simply too strong for any conclusion other than this: Racial inequality is still deeply rooted in American society and it has serious consequences. But now comes the hard part. Whose fault is it that racial inequality exists, and remains a fundamental cleavage in American society? Is it white racism, past and present? Or is it that blacks themselves are responsible for their wretched conditions because of the absence of a strong work ethic? Or because of a weak moral fabric? Or, a value system that has gone awry? Or, a weak female headed family structure? Or, addiction to welfare and other social pathologies? Could the real reason for racial inequality be that many blacks hide behind racism as the catchall excuse for their own failure in education and on the job market?

I think the view that blacks themselves are to be blamed for current racial inequality is becoming the dominant view of white America. This view helped elect Reagan and Bush to the Presidency. It was not irrelevant to the election of Clinton to the Presidency, for he avoided addressing problems of racial inequality head on; he avoided addressing questions of the inner city, while at the same time, courting the middle class white vote, making it known that change is needed to take place in the welfare system, etcetera.

I want to be clear about my position regarding the source of racial inequality in America. In my view, white racism, both historically and currently, is the ultimate source. I didn't say the only, but the ultimate source of racial inequality. And specifically, the actions and attitudes of white Americans are the primary reasons why racial inequality exists in America today.

This has been true historically and, as I said, it continues to be true. Now, let me be just a little bit more specific. White Americans with important positions, with power, such as the CEOs and managers of major corporations and those with money and influence in government are especially responsible for racial inequality in American society. For throughout American history, those with power and resources have been in the positions to affect the character of American society, to set the tone. And to make the major decisions affecting the lives of an entire nation. I also want to be clear here that I'm not singling out powerful white Americans as some sort of devils or bad people in this regard. There are saints and devils in all races. I would apply essentially the same sort of analysis to how American blacks have treated the native Liberians. So this is not an argument which claims that somehow there is some sort of innate devil making people do things.

But what I am arguing is that people with power and privilege tend to protect their interests in America as such groups have done down through history. And I think it's undeniable that relative to blacks, there have been whites who have controlled the bulk of American power. Moreover, because of history and deeds, whites have tended to have a genuine racist mentality, believing their race to be superior to blacks. This racist mentality was nurtured by two and one half centuries of slavery, another three quarter century of legal/racial segregation, and it is in fact, a mentality of white supremacy. A mentality that teaches that blacks are inferior and that the races should be kept separated.

Now I know that many whites probably feel that, yes, I could possibly agree that in the distant past, white racism and exploitation negatively affected the population. But I think many would now argue that this is not the reality of today. That after all, did not the civil rights movement and federal legislation undo the hideous past? But a key argument I wish to make, is that current racial conditions cannot be uncoupled from America's past. And to raise the question, why is it that in racial matters we now wish to forget the past?

We wish to forget that history. We don't wish to forget the American Revolution. Even though it happened in the past. We don't wish to forget the Fourth of July, that is, July of 1776, that's why we celebrate it every Fourth. We don't wish to forget World War I and World War II. We don't wish to forget the Holocaust. The reasons why we don't wish to forget these important developments is because we know that they mattered in shaping our current realities. And in determining who we are and what we can become. And we should not forget them. But many whites do want to forget the racism of the past, but yet, it has played a key role in shaping this nation and who we have become.

What would America be like if we just could do a social experiment? What would America be like if it did not benefit from two and one half centuries of free slave labor? What would it be like if Jim Crow never existed? That is, three quarters of a century of enforced racial apartheid in the South? What would Chicago be like today if racial discrimination never existed? To deny America's racist past prevents us from understanding and solving current racial inequalities.

I want to become more concrete and discuss the role of history in terms of race relations here in Chicago. Historic white racism created the current black inner city today. Because whites during the period when Chicago was founded thought themselves superior to blacks, they insisted from the very beginning, in Chicago, that blacks live apart from them. In the early 1900's, in this city, there was an imaginary color line in Lake Michigan, which any black person should not swim across. And in 1919, when one did, he was killed. And this sparked the first major riot in the city in 1919.

By the early 1900's, the housing discrimination and segregation gave rise to the black inner city. The ghetto. The projects. The ghettos and the projects did not come out of thin air. When blacks attempted to move into white neighborhoods, their homes were bombed in Chicago in the early 1900's. When the bombing became unfashionable, powerful whites, real estate agents, politicians, businessmen, came up with the ingenious restrictive covenant, which legally prevented blacks from moving into white neighborhoods. This method was more efficient than the bombs, and it was certainly more sanitary. So the very ghettos of today in Chicago, were created by white racism. The projects. The ghettos. They were thrown up one after another by powerful whites, in order to separate the black population as they streamed into this city from the South during the Twenties, the Thirties, the Forties and the Fifties. What is more, segregation on the job market occurred throughout this period. That is, blacks were relegated to what came to be known as the Negro jobs. Domestic work, menial labor in industry, janitors, elevator operators, red caps, pullman porters and the like. In short, right in this city, white economic leaders created a job ceiling insuring that blacks will remain at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy.

So St. Clair Drake and Horace Cayton in their definitive book on race relations in the nation, but this is a study of race relations in Chicago, during the Twenties, during the Thirties, and the Forties and it's definitely considered to be definitive, called *The Black*

Metropolis. They described the emerging black ghettos of Chicago in the 1930's. And I quote: "The job ceiling subordinates Negroes but does not segregate them. Restrictive covenants do both. They confine Negroes to the black belt and they limit the black belt to the most rundown areas of the city. There is a tendency for the Negro communities to become the dumping ground for vice, poor quality merchandise, and inferior white city officials. Housing is allowed to deteriorate and social services are generally neglected. Unable to procure homes in other sections of the city, Negroes congregate in the black belt." And what the Mayor's Committee discussed and the Mayor's Committee at the time was a committee that was created after the 1919 riots to say what is wrong with race relations in this city? So we get the pattern of the race riot and then established the committee to say what went wrong. And so this Mayor's Committee concluded that also the problem of congestion and overcrowding was a key problem in the black belt.

So ladies and gentlemen, what I'm really saying to you is that the creation of what we now know as the Robert Taylor Homes, Cabrini Green, Stateway Gardens, and all these other projects and so forth that we often come into contact with, largely through the news now, that these troubled inner city ghettos of today, were created because of white racism in this city of the past. They are the product of white behavior. Drake and Cayton looked at the problem and concluded in a very sober way, that it was housing discrimination, where blacks were forced to stay only in small parts of the city and that it was job discrimination that were the two pillars behind creating what we now talk about as the ghetto.

If we will be honest about this, we would have to argue that whites were the parent of the ghetto. And therefore, I would argue that they now are also responsible for change in terms of the ghetto. As the work of William Julius Wilson and many others show, the condition of the inner city is now worse today than when Drake and Cayton wrote about it in the 1940's. At least during that time, there were jobs for black people, although they were at the bottom of the occupational structure. I know that Doug Massey spoke earlier today. He, too, has shown that high levels of housing segregation right today, continues unabated.

So then, if this is all true, then it seems to me that the leaders of industry and of government for whatever reason to this day, and I'm sure there are many, have decided to move the plants and the factories out of the inner city. Or out of the reach of the people in the inner city. I think to talk about these changes as simply some sort of structural transformation, to talk about them as some sort of impersonal change, takes away human beings from these changes that have occurred. Real human beings, in board rooms and in meetings after meetings, make decisions about what corporations and plants will do. So that was the government at the local level, and federal level that endorsed those decisions for the plants and the factories that have served the city and inner city people for so long to leave.

If whites created the black ghetto, and if they are currently deeply ensconced in its maintenance, then they should change it. In my view, how do you correct the problem? If I were talking to powerful whites in this society, and most black people very seldom get a chance to do that, I would say that given that the private sector and given that government were the co-partners in producing and creating the ghetto, then they ought to be the co-partners in dismantling it.

And so I would argue that they need to create massive jobs for inner city people. So that they can work themselves out of the miserable conditions which they find themselves in. Secondly, I would argue that they should provide the resources needed to completely overhaul the public school system so that they educate children rather than enslave them. In a recent book by Jonathan Kozol, called *Savage Inequalities*, he laid out exactly why it is that the public schools, especially inner cities, are failing poor people and black people in this city. For one thing, when you look at public schools in affluent neighborhoods, you find that four or five times more money is being spent per child in those schools than in schools here in the inner city. Small wonder that the outcome is different. Thirdly, I would argue that corporate America and the government should start by changing the composition of those who are the decision makers in those corporations. So that blacks and other people of color have a real say about how to generate this massive kind of change. And I would argue that the truth as I was always told when I was young, is supposed to set you free, that if we look at corporate America and even at the government today, if we talk real power, that blacks and other minorities have token positions. They are not distributed in such a way that they are able to really effect the outcomes of these decisions.

It took the work of the government and the private sector to create the ghetto, and it is foolish to think that it will not take their efforts to bring about major change in the ghetto. If it doesn't make sense to think that those changes can come about without government and without corporate America, I would still have to conclude that it is very unrealistic to think that that is where change is going to come from. Because historically, that was not where change has been initiated in terms of race relations. It has always fallen on the shoulders of the African-American community itself, to organize and to produce that change. And we think about legal segregation in the United States, if black people did not organize and confront it head-on, there's no reason today to believe that it would not currently exist.

Let me just mention for a minute about black leadership. Right now, what is happening in my view is that very visible black leaders are saying, "yeah we really do have this serious problem in the inner cities now. And it's blacks themselves, in the sense that they don't engage in self-help. They don't respect each other. And they're killing each other." And I would say yes, that is absolutely correct. And that it should be addressed head-on by black leadership and anybody else in this society that is concerned. But one of the things that strikes me as very curious. Every time I hear these leaders and others who support them say right on to that, I never hear the leaders saying that for every good moral I'm going to give you now, I'm going to give you a job. For every time I preach about how you ought to respect yourself, I'm going to make sure that there's employment for you. I'm going to make sure that there are real educational opportunities. And so what I would have to conclude is that it is silly, it is foolish for us to think that by black leaders preaching to the people trapped in the ghettos, that all they need to do is to stand upright, to be morally pure, and to respect each other; and when they cannot deliver in terms of jobs, when they cannot change the school system in the inner city, when they cannot do that, then I would say that there's a certain amount of hypocrisy that they're engaging in, if they cannot bring those kinds of solutions while asking the people who are there trapped, to change.

What I would conclude with is simply this, that when you look at it historically, that it has been the protest option. It has been the organizing of millions of African-Americans and other people who really want to bring about change that has always been the key to push the private sector forward. It has always been the key that has pushed government forward. When A. Philip Randolph looked at the situation in the 1940's, black people could not get jobs in the war industry. And they were engaged, many of them, in crime and some of the same problems that we preach about today. But he didn't say, well, let me go in and save these people morally. He said, what we will have to do, is that we will have to organize millions of people to march on Washington and to protest what is going on. And this is where executive order 8802 came about, outlawing segregation within the defense industries. In the army, and the navy and so on.

I know that there are many who would say, well, you know, another tired liberal from the Sixties thinking that you need some more sit-ins and you need some more marches and so on, but that's a worn out kind of thing. What I would say is that, I think that when we look back historically, that certainly the struggles that built on top of each other were never the same as the ones in the past. They drew from those struggles, but they confronted the current, the contemporaneous problems that they had to solve. And we need not forget, I think, that when we celebrate Dr. King's birthday, and this holiday and so on, that Dr. King was assassinated while he was engaged precisely in the business of trying to organize the poor. Trying to solve the problem of income inequality in this society. Trying to solve the problems of jobs, that is when he was assassinated. And I would submit that nobody else on the scene has truly, truly picked up that torch.

And lastly, I hope that many of you would not conclude that what I'm saying is that whites have no role in bringing about change, that I'm concluding that the private sector and government and industry have no role. As I said, in my view the responsibility of change should be on them. They should accept that. When we look back, what we know is that when African-Americans have made a very serious movement for change, they always found whites and other people, who understood that it was equally their responsibility to change the conditions that exist. And it has been these kinds of movements that have been the drive for change in America. Thank you.

JAMES O'CONNOR

Ken mentioned that we had served back to back as Chairman of the Urban League some years ago, and I had the privilege of, it's impossible to follow in his footsteps, as he said, but I did have the opportunity to follow an individual for whom I have the greatest admiration.

When Jim Compton first approached me and asked if I would join the symposium today, I must tell you that I accepted with a rather tentative yes. Because I knew that I would be with two people who are renowned in their fields. One whose principal profession is the study of what has led to the condition that we are talking about today, and another gentleman who is admired throughout, not just our community, but throughout the country for his articulate view of these problems.

Some of you know that I had the experience of working with a couple of remarkable people, in fact, I didn't know he would be here, but one such gentleman was the father of John Ayres who is in the back row. Tom Ayres was my predecessor as chairman of Commonwealth Edison and I must tell you that I have yet to meet in my experience, an individual with a more keenly honed sense of conscienceness in the area of race relations than Tom Ayres. And that was in a period, Dr. Morris, where it wasn't terribly popular. I'm referring to the 1960's. And at the same time, I had the privilege of getting to know Bill Berry extremely well, whom I counted among my best friends in the Sixties and Seventies, and I recall so vividly a full week's vacation that I spent with Bill back in the early 1970's in Jamaica at George Johnson's home. And Bill was not a golfer, nor was he a tennis player, but he was world class in the art of conversation, as many of you know. And we discussed at length, the origins and possible solutions to many of the problems that confronted society at that time, and often our discussions would go to one or two in the morning and it seemed like he would always end up with the comment, "I'm not sure that you will ever completely understand, but keep on trying."

The areas where I have some degree of familiarity, that's in education, teen pregnancy, and housing, have shown me enough to convince me that as has been suggested, there is a need for very strong leadership and a dramatic effort to point us in the right direction. And I guess I view it as a joint responsibility. A responsibility that government, the corporate leadership, the labor leadership, community organizations and all individuals have in helping to bring this about.

Let me tell you my experience about infant mortality, since you touched on that in your comments. It is true that the rate in infant mortality is roughly double that for blacks as it is for whites. Eighteen per 1,000 children today die at the time of birth in the black community compared with slightly over nine per 1,000 in the white community. And these numbers are numbers which exceed the proportions in many, many Third World countries. The mothers of these infants in the main come from the city's poor, predominantly black neighborhoods. And fully one-third of all the maternity cases arrive at Cook County, having had no prenatal care.

Why do I mention this? I mention this because some years back I chaired a study which was to look at the cost of teen pregnancy. And we knew something about the cost of the problem, in terms of dollars, early on but we really had never calculated what the overall cost would be. We calculated that the cost of teen pregnancies in the middle 1980's was $835 million dollars a year. That was roughly $200 for every household in the metropolitan Chicago area. Today, all of us know that that number is well in excess of one billion dollars. What is most frustrating to me is that at the time we proposed an eight point program to address the problem, one that we felt would severely cut into the numbers that we had. Not just in terms of dollars, but in terms of human frustration and human loss. And unfortunately, most of the recommendations that were made were ignored. And today, the problem because of the aggravation caused by the situation involving drugs, only gets worse.

You might ask what does this have to do with race relations? In my judgement, just about everything. For teen pregnancy is symptomatic of many of the generic problems that confront the locked in underclass of our community. Our treatment of the problem historically is the classic case of applying remedies after the fact, whether it be hospital care or jails. It's far cheaper to address the problem at the front end, than to treat the consequences at the back end. And somehow we have not been able affectively to carry that message over into the sectors that so desperately need that type of effort. And, I guess, as we look forward, if there is one thing that we should recognize, it is not that we need only to talk about today, but we need to talk about tomorrow and what we can do today to make tomorrow better. And we're not very good at that.

In the area of education I don't pretend to be an expert at all, but almost thirty years ago, I began working with our then Vice Chairman of the company, Gordon Corey, who was a Vice Chairman also of a group called The Better Schools Committee. And that time the reputation of our city schools was not good. I can only tell you today it is far worse than it was then. But for the past seven years I've been involved in something else in Chicago in education, called The Big Shoulders Fund. We've been successful thus far in raising in excess of $36 million dollars to help support scholarships and teaching materials and helping to refurbish some 130 inner city schools. But they are parochial schools. And yet the numbers that we're talking about are some 43,000 young children. 43,000 by the way is larger now than the entire school system, public and private of Kansas City. And about two thirds the size of the school system of Boston. So it's not a small number. And the remarkable thing there is that by the seventh grade these young children are performing at a level equal to or better than their counterparts nationwide. Not just in Metropolitan Chicago, but nationwide. So something is being done correctly through this program. And there are lessons that we must be able to learn from that experience.

We can talk about all the distinctions that there are between the private and the public schools and the cream skimming and the parental attention and the mentoring, and all these other things. They're all true to some degree. But yet not even those distinctions explain away the fact that in the public school system today we have somewhat on the order of a fifty percent drop out rate, compared with less than one half of one percent drop out rate in the Catholic School System. Unless you think that this is solely a Catholic effort, we have a wide range of people involved of various backgrounds, various creeds, and various races, including Jim Compton, a member of our Executive Committee. And we're all trying to find out what it is that makes these schools function so well and what we can take from those schools to apply elsewhere.

Unfortunately, as Dr. Morris suggested, so many young blacks who go on to college are there because of their skill in some sport. And in many instances, unfortunately, as we look at the Memphis States, and Floridas and Alabamas, we find how few of them get through to the day of graduation. Julius Erving, who many recall fondly as Dr. J, tells the story of having Bill Russell, the great Boston Celtic center, visit the University of Massachusetts many years ago when Dr. J was a student as well as an athlete. And Russell asked what's the most important building on campus? And Dr. J and the other members of the basketball team immediately replied, the gym over there. And Russell argued it was not the gym. It was the library. And I think that this exchange says much about the priorities that we've imbued in our educational system. And is it any wonder that today some twenty percent of our population is functionally illiterate. The numbers are frightening and the wasted lives are a sin.

Now most everyone in this room probably knows more about the public school situation in Chicago and some of our outlying areas than I do. And it is hard to have any sense of hope about where we are going because of the many false starts that have been tried over recent years. Every now and then there's a beacon of hope with the appointment of people like Jim Compton to the School Board. Every now and then there's a beacon of hope. When there's talk of legitimate reform and yet we continue to seem to smother that small lighted candle in countless ways. We can't give up. The road to excellence is still there if we can find it. We've got to get on it and we must all collectively, each one of us who has a stake in the educational process, be a part of that journey.

You mentioned housing as another area that cries out for attention. For the past 25 years I've been associated with an organization called the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities. And that's a fair housing effort that attempts to put principles into action. And I recall Kale Williams, who for many years served as the Executive Director of the agency, and some very provocative remarks that he delivered at the annual meeting four years ago. And I'd like to read them to you, because I think they're significant. He noted that whenever we looked beneath the surface of the desperate problems of poor schools, of neighborhood deterioration, of high unemployment, of maternal and health care problems, of crime or of public housing, we find racial segregation as both a cause and a barrier to affective solutions. And then he played on something that we heard just a few moments ago, because it's a segregation that is more subtle than that which we might have had in the days when that famous book was written. And I'll quote him again. "1989 segregation is done with a smile, a polite statement, 'we just don't have anything available sooner than three months.' Or 'we're sorry the appraisal just came in too low to make a loan.' Or, 'you're income just doesn't qualify for private mortgage insurance.' Or 'let me show you this are, where you would be much happier.' All the subtle differences in treatment between white and African American, that end up maintaining the walls and adding to the burden and tightening the chocking hand of residential segregation."

And that's why I say once again that we need all the forces of our community from city government and HUD and the business community, neighborhood organizations, the real estate industry, working together to stop the latest attempts to panic whole neighborhoods into resegregation.

I've talked a little bit about my experience and what my view is of some of the problem areas. And the right question to ask is one that was posed a short while ago, and that is, what are you in a position to do about it? And it is true that we have a very special obligation in our role as CEOs and as corporate officers to try to make a difference. And maybe I speak from perhaps a slightly different perspective than most because the company that I represent whose product electricity serves virtually every resident in the metropolitan community. We have a special obligation to try to understand and do what we can to address the concerns of the communities that we serve. To that end, yes, we have long had a commitment to try to have a work force that mirrors the population that we serve. And again I go back to John's father who in the early 1960 was determined that on a percentage basis that we would have African Americans in our company, at the same level, or higher, than the African American level percentagewise that we serve. And we're there. Is that good enough? No. The steps taken by us to achieve a multi-cultural work force through affirmative action programs must continue through aggressive recruitment practices, community involvement, training and development programs and meaningful promotions and goals.

To refer to the token African American in many organizations, what Bill Berry used to refer somewhat facetiously to as the Eatin' and Meetin' representatives, who would be sent out cosmetically to demonstrate a company's commitment, that's not what we are talking about. We are talking about bonafide positions of line responsibility. Bonafide positions of decision making authority. And we've got to continue to work with our people particularly as we look forward to a society in another five to ten years, which will be increasingly diverse. We've got to learn from each other.

Some of you know Cordell Reed who's our Senior Vice President, has been for years. Responsible for all of our nuclear and now our coal fire operations. Cordell is a truly distinguished citizen of our community. And we talked the other day about how do we manage diversity going forward? And Cordell and a number of others will be off to Corning, New York in three weeks to learn from a company that is considered among the best and most thoughtful companies in its approach to exploring the various avenues in managing diversity. We've got to do it. We can't afford to stand still, we can't afford to plateau, we must do better than we have. And that's a major challenge for us.

In addition to creating job opportunities for minorities, we for a long time supported minority business development. And I'll sound like a broken record again when I mention Tom Ayres who along with Bill Berry was one of the original founders of an organization called The Chicago Business Opportunity Affairs in 1969. But it was that group that kind of launched the activity. And we're somewhat proud, not overly proud or arrogant about our record in this area. But we've seen it to continue to climb. But we recognize at the same time that in an era where restructuring is common, we're right sizing, or down sizing. Where more and more companies are reducing the number of vendors in certain areas, it is ever more important to try to identify and work with vendors from the minority business area who can assist us in a meaningful way. Not by the token job here or there, but by substantive activities that will assist us at the same time that it assists the minority vendor or service provider.

That's selfish in a way. Because as I said earlier, we are a company that serves the entire area. We're not in a position where we can lift our lines and transformers and go off to the suburbs or down to Tennessee. We're here. And we've got to have a recognition of the importance of the viability, the continued viability of the communities that we serve.

In addition to these areas we've got to have a culture that calls on our managers and our employees to be involved. This morning I addressed the opening session of the steering committee for the United Way. I'm serving, having served five years ago as the Chairman of the United Way Crusade of Mercy, I've been demoted and now serve as Vice Chairman, because I think it is so critically important that I and that our company demonstrate how essential the 300 agencies who receive support from the United Way are. And without these agencies the pain which is already being visited on so many hundreds of thousands of Chicagoans would be far worse. So we need to show in a meaningful way that we care, and that caring counts not just for Jim O'Connor but for 19,000 employees who can do something. We've got to encourage it and we've got to support it. We've got to make allowances for it. To attend the board meetings and to do those sorts of things that are essential to helping agencies and activities flourish. And it's got to be very much a part of corporate life.

You know in a city like ours where we often times pride ourselves on being the best whether it's the symphony or whether it's the Bulls or having the greatest player to ever put on a pair of sneakers in Michael Jordan, it doesn't feel very good to be told that you have the most segregated city in the United States. Nor does it feel good to be told that you have the worst school system in the country. That hurts, particularly if you are a life long resident of this community as I am. And maybe we do need to restate the theme that was annunciated by Daniel Burnham almost a 100 years ago as we address our race and poverty problems. We need to be bold, as Burnham said, make no little plans because they have no magic to stir men's blood.

We need to force the coalitions and entities of all kinds wherever collective effort will serve to advance the community's interest. And it always amazes me at how much can be accomplished when people are not quite so concerned about who gets the credit. I've watched causes, countless of them, dissolve because people or organizations fought over who would get the star billing. And I guess you might call this the investment banker mentality. From a business standpoint the most successful activities that I've ever witnessed are those where people were willing to sacrifice their personal and institutional identities for the good of the whole. And we should never be so proud as to fail to recognize someone else's good idea nor should we fall victim to the not invented here syndrome. We've got to embrace the ideas of others when they can bring us even one step closer to the achievement of our goal of making our community a better place.

What does it take to get there? It almost seems so simplistic that I'm embarrassed to say it, but initially and absolutely essentially it means that we've got to incorporate into the creed or code of conduct of every single one of our organizations the importance of the dignity of man. That all should know that we will be intolerant of prejudice due to race, creed, or religion. And that we will fight for the basic rights of those employees who are victims of prejudice either in the work place or in society at large. And we've also got to pledge to work hard to develop in our everyday business life a sensitivity that reflects the truism that all people are not the same. That they come from different backgrounds and from different environments and from different schools. And that some need more help and more understanding than others. It means in part that we often have to take, as my mother used to say, people as they are and not as you would like them to be. There's a little known author by the name of Arnold Bennett who once observed that it is very well in judging another to remember that he is judging you with the same God-like and superior impartiality.

We've got to raise our expectations. How often we find that we get exactly what we expect. I know that I find that in business. I can only assume that we find that in schools. I've a daughter who just spent this past year out at 62nd and Laflin teaching in a school. Remarkable results. Enthusiasm. But she came in with an expectation that these children were going to succeed. That failure was unacceptable and that she would not pass on to the sixth grade a product that wasn't fully capable of meeting the challenge of that course of study. And she took tremendous satisfaction from being a part of that process. Leo Burnett, who was the great advertising guru for so many years in this area, penned the following words: "When you reach for the stars, you may not quite get one, but you won't come up with a handful of mud either." And perhaps some of us, especially those of us who are the products of the Me Too generation, have forgotten just how important it is to press our fellow workers and our kids, or those who look up to us, to become just as good as they possibly can. We've got to do that.

And we need to hurl a similar challenge at our institutions whether they be governmental or schools or corporations or social organizations to which we belong. And what is wrong with asking those institutions to set their sights on becoming the best of their kind in their particular business.

And yes, we've got to assign accountability. We need to establish specific goals and then we need to hold specific people accountable for reaching those goals. That's hard because the consequences of failing to be accountable can be very severe. But it's got to be done. It won't work otherwise. And we need to establish our goals and our businesses when it comes to minority hiring and purchasing. And to our commitments to those organizations which work in a variety of areas which promote racial harmony.

In going back to our educational systems, you know, wouldn't it be nice if we could talk about one day becoming world class in education? Wouldn't that be a ride to go from the bottom to the top? We're never going to start unless we begin to aspire to get to that level. And somehow or other we haven't begun. We need to face up to the unpleasant realities and we need to bring them out in the open. We need to be more candid about our problems. There have been a lot of irresponsible people and a lot of irresponsibility over many centuries. And believe me there's a lot of guilt and blame to be spread around. But I hope that won't make us timid nor will it cause us to shy away from a candid discussion of our problems.

Obviously minorities are being short changed in our educational system. They're getting far less schooling than they should in math or English. White, black and Hispanic leaders must demand change and we must also demand that the students accept the responsibility to achieve. We need to continue to put our full support behind organizations like the Urban League.

Just as I walked out the door today I was handed a notice that the Committee On Economic Development, which is a major group out of New York, plans to come to Chicago in the very near future to put it's full resources into a program addressed to helping to solve the problems of the inner city. They skirted around them often times in the past. A lot of the stuff that they've done has been very esoteric. This is going to be a hard headed, hard nosed look at the problems in ways in which corporate America, government and others can assist in the process of trying to correct them.

Today we measure success in a lot of ways. And I guess in our business we call it return on equity or what have you, or who's masterminded the biggest buy out. Let me just leave you with a simple definition of success which seems to have had a lot more meaning than any of these measures. And was provided a long time ago by Ralph Waldo Emerson. And a lot of you probably heard it. And it goes as follows, the definition of success is to laugh often and much to win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children. To earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends. To appreciate beauty, to find the best in others, to leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child or a redeemed social condition. To know that even one life has breathed easier because you lived, this is to have succeeded. Thank you very much.

KENNETH SMITH: We thank both of our speakers for their presentations this afternoon. Dr. Morris began with a quote from W.E.B. Dubois study of the Philadelphia Negro. And it was a reminder to us that he also coined the statement that the problem of the twentieth century would be the problem of race. His analysis of that problem was laid out before us. Mr. O'Connor, among other things that he said, reminded me of something that the late Benjamin E. Mays, always said, not failure, but low aim. And he reminded us of the obligations of all of us, government, the private sector and individuals to become involved in finding solutions.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Thank you very much Dr. Smith. I am Tim Black. I get concerned continuously when I hear the word inner city. I begin to wonder where that stops. There are some places in Morgan Park from the central city that are called the inner city. I think it has some special meaning. And also I hear the denial of ghettoization very often as being a place where only the poor live. My experience both European and American teaches me that the ghetto is where people are confined, regardless to their economic or social attainments. They're confined because of their race or their ethnicity or whatever the other reasons may be. They are confined, they are not free to move.

One of the things I think that we need to explore out of all of this is what are the consequences, not for the individuals of the communities which are besieged, but what are the consequences for the nation? We very often put these in a little package as if these people would behave or if some of us just go in there and tell them to be good, that everything will be all right. And we give them a few things to be all right with individually, and that would be it. But there are larger consequences, I think, that the nation has to measure. I wish some of the social scientists and others would begin to say what are the implications if we do not solve this racial problem? By recognizing that the whole nation, whether we are newcomers or not newcomers, started wrong. Slavery, morally, intellectually, economically, except for a few, was a wrong start to fulfill the concept of equality of all men. We have never really nationally admitted or apologized for that. The German government apologized to the Jewish community for the Holocaust. It still has problems. The Japanese have apologized to certain groups. The United States has never admitted officially that it has, in fact, created a situation for which it now has consequences that it eventually will have to deal with. I wish the social scientists would begin to look at if we do not solve these educational social, economic problems, this is what's going to happen to the nation.

ALDON MORRIS: Well I think that you put your finger on something that's very important. Clearly it seems to me that there is a question of whether you actually have a robust democracy. It is the same question that people are dealing with in many parts of the world, and in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and China and so on. It's the whole question about whether human beings, all of them, are worthy and what are the obligations of the nation, of all of the citizens, to make sure that all people are equal? And so I think that in the final analysis what it's going to mean is that if we don't solve this problem, and when I say this problem, talking about racial equality, I would quickly add that I am well aware that racial inequality is also intricately tied into the question of poverty. And we know that that is not simply a problem of black people. I would say that at a conference like this, we really ought to be and in a city like Chicago, we really ought to be dealing with the situation of Hispanics in the city. Because they too are experiencing kinds of problems and so on. And so I think that ultimately what it means is that, is that if we don't confront these problems and solve them and stop putting them in a corner as if they are isolated from everything else, it will say a great deal about whether we actually were ever able to create a democracy in America. I think that's the one big thing.

I think that secondly you fail to nourish people's talents, to discover their talents, at very young ages. I mean often when I go back to the neighborhoods that I grew up in and by the projects and just park the car or just sit there for a while and just look at all the little kids running around. And knowing that there's a whole bunch of genius somewhere there. But that the possibility of it ever being discovered, let along nourished, is pretty much out of the question. Then I wonder what kind of nation have we become that this kind of thing seems not to matter. So I think the other part of your issue is what will this nation look like, even now, but certainly in the future if we don't take full advantage of all of the talent and the genius that exists in the human community. And I think that's what we're failing to do as a community within the entire world.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Good afternoon, my name is Harold Lucas. I'm a community organizer and urban preservationist with the Community Workshop on Economic Development. I want to say that my concerns are about the systematic gentrification of the inner city. How do we prevent that as we move forward and to make some pro-active recommendations for the record for this symposium. First of all I want to say I support one hundred percent of the remarks by Dr. Aldon Morris and I'm glad that he used the sociological and anthropological documentation that was used in *Black Metropolis*, which I think is the key document for African Americans in this city to use as a basis for our empowerment. I work every day in the communities of Chicago. We do collaborations, we do coalitions. This is our business, this is what we're about.
I want to make four recommendations and I hope they will be followed up on. The first one is an intercultural recommendation for Africans in Chicago. And that is the need to break down the stratification within the race for the upper classes, or those who think that they've made it into middle class reality. And we know that there's a recent book out talking about the rage of the black middle class. Clearly that's a joke and that they need to come home and help low income people so we can stabilize inner city black communities.

Second we need to encourage the development of collaborations within low income communities. A bottom up organizing process, the trickle down theory has not worked since it was first launched by, I think, Mr. Reagan. Clearly we need to come the other way in the resources need to go as deeply as possible into the communities. We need to encourage leadership development among grass root people. When I say that consensus leadership, multiple leaders, many, many, many leaders to address the multiple problems that we address every day.

And then we need to provide from a corporate perspective, the Chicago Initiative, and other major funding initiatives like that need to provide multi year funding to these low income communities through their collaborations. That will provide jobs and build new institutions. We've got two major collaborations that have received some publicity. Notedly the Black Metropolis Plan, i.e. Bronzeville. There's a story currently in the January issue of the *Reporter* that talks about that story. The fight on the West side to save the Sears catalog warehouse, where Federal dollars, and Dr. Smith, you might know about this, Federal dollars earmarked for preservation of low income communities are being used to demolish a low income community and a historical landmark that's registered at the same level as the Statue of Liberty. To create up-scale housing in a community that has a median income of $8,000 dollars. They're building $80,000 dollar homes. And what's even more ludicrous, they're using CDBG dollars and Federal dollars that should support the empowerment of low income people to do it.

Also there are other collaborations, cross cultural collaborations. Very clearly there's one in the far south community called the Far South Consortium, which was the first program funded by the Department of Planning and Development. That deals with the historical Pullman Development. They received two million dollars in the last legislative session. Developing Communities Project was a coalition of middle and upper income home owners in the far south community. And the Mexican Community Committee. They're in a collaboration around the Morris and Knudsen Project out south. That needs to be supported. So we can create jobs there. I want to use a quote from 1942 also now. I think it's most appropriate and it was written by Richard Wright and it's for black people. It says, "will the Negro find a meeting in his humiliation. Make his slums and his sweat shops his modern cathedrals out of which will be born a new consciousness that can guide him towards freedom. Or, will he continue as he does today, saying job like to a society that crushes him. Though it slays me, yet I will trust it." Lastly, we at the Mid-South Planning and Development Commission and residents in the greater Lawndale community accept the challenge of Richard Wright. We have our plans. We have a major document planning and mechanism for the next ten years. We have a billion dollar plan to restore Bronzeville, the original black community in Chicago. We are saying that if corporate America is serious about breaking the cycle of welfare dependency, drug addiction and crime in the inner city neighborhoods of the south and west side, then come now with the capital and philanthropic support funding, and the technical assistance. And together we can rebuild inner city neighborhoods and empower low income people in the process so that Chicago can truly be a world class city in the 21st century.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I'm Edna Pardo with the League of Women Voters. Illinois is a very wealthy state. We're eleventh in wealth and we're fifty in assets in the country. Yet eighty percent of the children in Illinois are receiving an inadequate education that's inadequately funded. It's interesting, while we think of this in terms of Chicago, I went to a meeting a week ago where the same problem was raised in relation to St. Charles. The business community complained that the students are graduating without being able to read. I'm sure that's one of the under-funded communities as well. Seventy percent of the children in the Chicago schools are poor so that it behooves us to really deal with the kind of education that will reach everyone of these children. Education is public policy and as public policy it requires public finance. And we believe this state has long been derelict in the issue of public finance. And it's time we addressed the problem seriously. The state League and Progress Illinois has drawn together fifty statewide organizations in support of a graduated income tax. We feel that's absolutely essential to provide a fair amount of revenue for our schools and other social services. We urge that all of you support the campaign for Fair Funding for our schools and the state as a whole. Thank you.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: Talmadge Betz from Windows of Opportunity. My question, I guess, is pretty basic. I've been here all day and earlier in the day I heard Douglas Massey say that the onus of race discrimination and racism was on whites. And that whites really ought to change, because it was the right thing to do. I heard Dr. Morris say that if whites created the black ghetto, then they should change it. I heard Jim O'Connor say that racism in the Nineties is a lot more subtle than it was in the past and that it's done with a smile. It's still systematic, but it's done with a smile. My question is this, human behavior for me is that people change when there is a clear cut physical or economic incentive or inducement. If there is, if whites should change, what are the clear cut, physical, tangible economic inducements for them to change and to stop being discriminatory?

JAMES O'CONNOR: I think part of it comes from what is done in the corporate community where you have goals set out for people that include the sorts of initiatives that you're talking about. We base, for example, is part of people's compensation. Their effectiveness in the area of training, in minority business development. Everyone has clear cut goals at the beginning of the year. That is an economic inducement to perform. And these are goals that are set forth and then challenged, and then go back and forth. And it's always above the level that we had the year before. And a good percentage of an individuals compensation and a significant percentage of his review is based off of how successful they are in these certain social indicators. And that's one at this senior management level. And we think that is one way to get people's attention. So it's much more than lip service.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I'm Sam Ackerman, Education Director at Comprend, and one of the volunteer trainers with the Racism Reduction Institute. I've a question in a whole different domain. In the Sunday *Tribune* magazine the cover article was called "Dumbocracy," "Dumbocracy." By a Professor from Harvard, which was an attack on so-called political correctness. A term that was kind of invented by the people who oppose everything we've been talking about in this room today. It was very disturbing to me. Did any of you see that? Well, I command it to you because it's insidiously frightening because a publication like the *Tribune* magazine is read by literally hundreds of thousands of people, if not more than that, maybe millions. And this guy postulated that everything from creating multi-cultural organizations to date rape was part of this thing he calls political correctness. And I urge you all to read this and someone to begin to respond to it because it's impacting the mentality of lots of people who think they are thinking people. And this guy even said liberals have no brains, they only have feelings, or something like that. You know, I was a little insulted by that. I know some liberals who have brains, maybe I'm not one of them. But I wonder if each of you could comment on how to deal with this emerging attack on so called political correctness in terms of the kind of progress we're attempting to make. Could each of you make a short comment on that?

ALDON MORRIS: Well, I think that on the one hand certainly we have to take on that kind of challenge intellectually. We can take it on in print and speak out against that. But at the same time I think that we have to recognize that for those who would preserve the status quo, that there are going to always be various ways in which it's done. Various symbolic tools that are going to be used to accomplish that. And I would therefore say that we quickly respond to that but move on and deal with the much more important task that you're doing in terms of your work, or the gentleman there talking about saving Bronzeville. And talking about all of the things that they're doing. I think that you confront that kind of thing by your own deeds and not get side tracked by somebody else's agenda. And that agenda being precisely to maintain any quality in the society.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: I'd like to ask Mr. O'Connor a question. Would you be willing to hold a sensitivity work shop for the CEOs of every bank in Chicago? So that they can find some kind of way to stop disinvesting? So that people can live in neighborhoods and feel that their home is just as good as any other home in the region. Thank you.

JAMES O'CONNOR: The whole CRA program, the Community Reinvestment Act guidelines are out there. I think it has really sensitized the bankers today. Now, I won't speak about years ago. But I will tell you that I think there is a renewed commitment. The one person I know in this area who has a stellar track record, Dave Paulus at First Chicago. And I see some heads nodding. I mean David is absolutely committed and I think one thing that can be done is to talk to David. And to say, David how did you get there? I mean this is the reality not just theory. But how did you get there? And can you share what you have been able to accomplish with others? And that's something that I will be happy to do. I will be happy to talk to David.

AUDIENCE QUESTION: [Mrs. Tailor] Well first I'll have to ask for forgiveness because this is a very different statement from what has been made. It starts off with a new day has dawned, let all people accept it. To all writers never again dissect Negro Americans as a separate group. We must accept the fact that we are just American people. We do not need anymore first black. They have accomplished enough now not to have to brag first anything. How long do you want to lay dead and let people use you to make a bad notoriety at your expense? It would be a lot to help people to know they are individuals. People don't have to accept the fact that they have to be a gang to be a good American. A new day is emerging. For mixed blood Americans we must shake loose the devil, he's had his way with us long enough. It will be our choice always to decide whether we will remain crucified. Or whether we will let the love of God lift us up to a newer and better life and speak for ourselves.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

JAMES COMPTON

I hope that each of us leaves here today having discovered some new way to approach the problems of racial conflict and poverty. Or at least a new appreciation for why one or another group may respond as it does to any given issue. So as we work to advance the public debate on how to create the most equitable society possible in this nation and this city. To eliminate racial discrimination and create a society that benefits all, those who will provide leadership we believe had a responsibility to acknowledge and understand the hopes, concerns and aspirations of all corners of our diverse community.

To achieve effective long term solutions to our problems, their full complexity must be considered and understood. And while we stand absolutely strong in our demand for full justice under the law, and can never compromise on principals of simple fairness and equity and justice, we must plainly acknowledge and seek to understand differences in culture, history and where a divergent point of view is offered in the spirit of seeking a better city, better state, and a better world. It is our intention at the Chicago Urban League to continue these kinds of dialogues. But also equally and if not more importantly to present sharper focus and trying to create an agenda that will better attack and address these issues of race and poverty. Thank you.